LOS ANGELES REGIONAL WATER

QUALITY CONTROL BOARD MEETING

PROPOSED SUNSHINE CANYON LANDFILL

AND DRAFT WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

GRANADA HILLS, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2003

Reported by: CATHERINE SCOTT, C.S.R. No. 3375

Job No.: 03-25162

APPEARANCES:

Los Angeles Regional
Water Quality Control Board Members:

Susan Cloke - Chairwoman

Dennis Dickerson - Executive Officer

I N D E X

GRANADA HILLS, CALIFORNIA; WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 2003

3:08 P.M.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: My name is Susan Cloke. I chair the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. Today's meeting is a meeting of the Water Quality Control Board on the proposed Sunshine Canyon Landfill and Draft WDR.

We are here today to take your testimony so that it can be heard and read by the full board at the meeting when we vote on the permit having to do with the water protection, pursuant to the proposal for the Sunshine Canyon Landfill.

That vote will take place at our July meeting, at our meeting at July 24th, which will be held at the MWDI in downtown Los Angeles.

We are going to begin this meeting as we begin all meetings by reciting the pledge of allegiance. So if you would, please, stand and join in.

(Pledge of allegiance)

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you. I want to spend just a couple of minutes telling you about the Regional Board. Then, I'm going to talk to you about today's meeting and how we're going to organize today's

meeting so that everybody will know what to expect.

The Regional Board is composed of nine members, all appointed by the governor of the State of California. We are given the mission of protecting and enhancing the waters of the State of California for present and future generations. That's pretty much a direct quote off our mission statement.

To that end, we process permits, write policy, write basin plans, and other forms of legislation and rule-making which is designed to protect ocean waters, rivers, groundwater, and so on.

Obviously, in the case of a landfill, our concern is with the groundwater. We are not a land use agency. We do not have jurisdiction or authority to make siting decisions. We are not a zoning agency.

We do not have authority or jurisdiction to make zoning decisions. We are a water quality agency, and it is our responsibility to make sure that if there is going to be a landfill sited in this location that our groundwater will be protected.

And I wanted to say that to you because I know that there are many concerns regarding the landfill proposal, and I wanted to let you know what the limits of our authority and jurisdiction were so that you could know what it was we would be charged

with or what our responsibility was and what we have the authority and the power to do.

We're going to start today's meeting with an introduction from Dennis Dickerson, who is sitting to my right. He's the executive officer of the Regional Quality Control Board in Los Angeles, and he's going to talk to you about the entire landfill issue and explain technical issues to you.

At the end of his testimony, we are going to take your testimony. Anybody who wishes to speak, please, fill out one of these blue cards. Print your name legibly because everything is being recorded by the court transcriber, sitting right over here, and we want to have your names spelled correctly in our records.

So fill out one of these blue cards, and make sure you give it to me. That's the way you get called to speak. Each speaker will have three minutes, and there is a timer on the table over there, but also, I'll help you watch the time.

As you're speaking, some of you may have questions. Our staff is here to write down the questions that you may have or the issues that you may raise during your testimony.

When the entire portion of this meeting

that is dedicated to public testimony is concluded, staff will come back and have the opportunity to try to give you the factual information and to answer the questions you've asked, as best as they can.

As you can see, we're a relatively small group this afternoon, and so what I'm hoping is that we'll have time to take testimony and, then, perhaps, have a few minutes to speak less formally later.

Because this is a meeting for testimony for a permit that we will be voting on, I am going to ask everyone who either has submitted a blue card or who thinks they might intend to submit a blue card plus all the staff who intend to testify or answer questions today to take the oath, and so if that's you, please, join me and stand.

Audience participants of the Los Angeles Water Board Meeting, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: At this point, I'd like to introduce Mr. Dickerson, our executive officer.

MR. DICKERSON: Thank you, board members. I'm pleased to be here today. My name is Dennis Dickerson. I'm the executive officer with the Regional

Board, and with me, also, today are a number of our staff who I'll introduce to you a bit later.

What I'm going to do today, this afternoon, is walk you through a slide show. I have a number of photos to orient you to the site. I will be reading the text of the presentation just so I get it all right, and I hope you'll bear with me on that.

Are we up? Ready? Lights? Camera?

So what I'm going to be doing here today is discussing the proposed Sunshine Canyon Landfill expansion and the tentative waste discharge requirements, which the Regional Board staff agrees to it as WDR, and for convenience, during the rest of my presentation, I'm going to refer to that as the permit instead of WDR so it's a bit clearer for you.

For those of you who are not familiar with the term "Tentative Document," at the Regional Board, this is something that we do at the staff level. We prepare a document which is called a "Tentative," and it's a "Tentative Permit."

It, then, goes before the board for actual, formal consideration and adoption, and at the time of their hearing, they can make changes on it as well. They can reject it. They can put it off for another meeting. Any number of things can happen in a

tentative document, but because you see --

I, actually, have it right here, and it's one of the handouts that we have outside. When you see the document, you'll see on the left corner there -- I'm sorry -- the right corner down the row. It says, "Continue" (inaudible). So it's a draft document, one that's for board consideration. It's not final.

All right. Following my presentation, we will be listening to your thoughts and questions, and as our chair, Susan Cloke, has already identified, there will be an opportunity for the board and staff to go into detail with the questions that you've asked.

The next slide is the aerial photograph of the landfill. There's, also, another one, very similar one, a copy of the exact same, on the table down there.

So a little bit later, you'll have a chance to take a closer look at that, and it's located at the border between the city of Los Angeles and the unincorporated territory of Los Angeles County.

It's to the west of the intersection of the Golden State Freeway, I-5, and the Antelope Valley Freeway, to the SR-14, and you'll see there on the upper left is the County Landfill portion, and below that is the existing old City Side Landfill.

The Sunshine Canyon Landfill includes two

separate Class III municipal solid waste management units, and these are referred to sometimes as the Sunshine Canyon City Side Landfill and the Sunshine County Extension Landfill.

Under our current regulations, the Class III landfills are those landfills that receive only nonhazardous municipal solid wastes or regular trash that you put out and is taken away. That's the primary trash that goes to this facility.

Both the City Side Landfill and the County Extension Landfill are owned and operated by Browning Ferris Industries of California -- the Sunshine Canyon County Extension Landfill.

Under our current regulations, a Class III landfill is those that receive only nonhazardous municipal solid waste or regular trash that you put out and comes, gets collected, and taken away to the landfill. That's the kind of trash that goes to this facility.

Both the City Side Landfill and the County Extension Landfill are owned and operated by Browning Ferris Industries of California.

This is a recent photograph of the City Side Landfill. The City Side Landfill began accepting solid waste in 1958. It ceased operations in September

of 1991. The final cover in the City Side Landfill consists of a soil cover with a minimum thickness of six feet.

As is the case with most of these Class III landfills operated during that time, the City Side Landfill is not equipped with any of the protective measures required today or our current regulations to contain and remove containers from the landfill, which is to say the garbage was placed directly on the ground and then covered up.

This is the County Extension Landfill, which is currently open and receiving waste. This is a photograph of their active area. That particular landfill began operation in 1996, and it will reach its capacity in about three to four years.

It currently receives an average of 6,000 tons of municipal solid waste per day. Unlike the City Side Landfill, the County Extension Landfill has been constructed to meet Federal and State standards for Class III landfills and is equipped with a composite liner and a leachate collection and removal system.

Now, in this photograph, behind the trucks on the face of the garbage there, you'll see the area that's being pointed out. That's, actually, the liner portion of the landfill. You can, actually, see it

there before it's covered up with, first, a certain amount of soil. I can give you more details about the liner construction later; then, the waste placed on top of that.

The purpose of the liner, of course, is to add additional protection to ensure that any contamination of leachate that's generated in the landfill is properly collected.

Now, landfills in California are mainly regulated by the California Integrated Waste Management Board and the State Water Resource Control Board through our agency. The Waste Board and its local enforcement agencies, in this case, the city of Los Angeles and the county of Los Angeles, are responsible for regulating the daily operations of landfills, such as waste disposal activities, traffic control, nuisance control, and other types of those issues.

The Regional Water Quality Control Board -- that's us -- is responsible for regulating the construction of liners, leachate collection and removal systems, water quality monitoring, and the requirements for final closure of the landfill.

Now, there's a number of existing permits that apply to the landfill. I'll be going through

those in somewhat more detail. This just gives you a quick outline what those are.

The first is the existing permit for the City Side Landfill, and this is an order that was adopted by the Regional Board back in 1987 and was adopted on November 23rd of that year, and it covers landfill operations at the site, and this permit, in particular, needs to be upgraded to reflect the current status of the landfill, such as post-closure maintenance activities.

The next is the current Regional Board Permit for the County Extension Landfill, which was adopted in July of 1991, and it covers operations of current existing Class III landfills. Besides the site-specific permit, the County Extension Landfill is also regulated by Board Order 93-062, and it's also referred to as a "Super Order."

That was adopted in June of 1993, and it contains federal/state waste disposal regulations and is applicable to all Class III landfills that have been active since October of 1991. The Super Order was not applied to the City Side Landfill, which is now closed, because it stopped accepting waste before the Federal deadline.

However, if the proposed expansion is

approved, all the Federal regulations in the Super Order will be applicable to the City Landfill Extension.

Next is the storm water permits, and the entire canyon, Sunshine Canyon Landfill, is regulated by a General Storm Water NPDES Permit for industrial activities, and this covers the rainfall that may fall onto the property, and as that rainfall runs over the property and heads out of the property into a stream, there's a permit that covers that, and that's what we're talking about here.

It requires BFI, Browning Ferris Industries, to implement Best Management Practices -- or BMPs is what we call them, and those are intended to protect storm water discharge from the site from being contaminated by landfill operations.

For any major construction site, such as the development of a landfill cell of five acres or larger, BFI is also regulated by a General NPDES Storm Water Permit and, specifically, for those activities which are associated with construction.

As the County Extension Landfill will reach its design capacity as proposed by 2007, BFI has proposed a separate landfill extension that would join the two existing landfills together. However, because

the two local enforcement agencies, namely, the city and county of Los Angeles, were not able to review the application jointly, BFI decided to first apply for a landfill expansion only within the city of Los Angeles.

Now the next slide will show you the footprint of the proposed landfill expansion. This new landfill unit -- and you can see that in the brown -- is proposed to be developed over an area, approximately, 84 acres with a net capacity of about 7.5 million tons of municipal solid waste. The operational life of this phase of the landfill expansion, if approved, would be approximately for 4.8 years.

BFI referred to this expansion as the Phase I of the City Landfill and has indicated that it will apply for Phase II expansion later, assuming, of course, that Phase I is approved.

Phase II expansion of the City Landfill would be expected to occupy the remainder of the area within a blue dashed line, which should come up momentarily. Is it already there? Oh, there it is. So it would actually expand from these brown areas under a proposed Phase II into that area, as you can see.

The next slide shows you the County

Extension Landfill and the areas for proposed City Side Landfill expansion. So here you get a pretty good graphic sense of where the current landfill is up to the upper left, and you see the City Side there, and you see the expansion areas where that would go.

In order for the Regional Board to adopt a permit to regulate operations of the proposed landfill operation, the city of Los Angeles must first approve the landfill expansion in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act or CEQA.

The CEQA document, The Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report, or SEIR, for the expansion of the City Side Landfill was certified by the city of Los Angeles in October of 1999. By the summer of that year, the Los Angeles City Council passed an ordinance that changed the zoning, where the City Landfill is located, from agriculture to heavy industrial to accommodate the proposed landfill expansion.

The proposed City Landfill expansion and the final closure of the existing City Side Landfill would result in the removal of more than five acres of wetlands at the site.

Pursuant to the Federal Clean Water Act, BFI must compensate for the loss of any wetlands area. A 401 Certificate must be issued by the U.S. Army Corp

of Engineers, and a 401 Certificate must be issued by the Regional Board before any construction is started. The 401 Certificate application is processed by the Regional Board staff separately from the permit and is currently pending for action.

To obtain a Regional Board Permit for a proposed landfill expansion, an applicant must submit what's called a "Joint Technical Document" equivalent to a permit application that contains information concerning this case, the proposed expansion of the City Side Sunshine Landfill, and the document itself is up here on the table. It's these two volumes that we have, and it's, also, a document that I understand is nearby your local library for your review.

The application is called a "Joint Technical Document" because it is also submitted to other regulatory agencies, such as the California Waste Management Board, and it's used, really, to apply for multiple permits. So you have a single document.

For the rest of this discussion, I will refer to the Joint Technical Document as a Consolidated Permit Application. I think that just makes a lot more sense to follow that.

BFI submitted the Consolidated Permit Application for the proposed landfill expansion to the

Regional Board in February of 2002. Regional Board staff had reviewed the application, provided comments, received responses to those comments from BFI, had determined that the application was now complete for the purposes of developing a Tentative Permit. The Consolidated Permit Application is available for you at the Granada Hills Public Library. The next slide is just a closer-up look at that document.

Okay. Now, with regard to the Tentative Permit, Regional Board staff has developed that document, including a tentative monitoring and reporting program. These documents have been sent out for public comment, and copies of the documents can be obtained here today or downloaded from our Internet Web site.

The Tentative Permit, as you heard earlier, will be heard by the Regional Board on July 24 at the Special Board Meeting at the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. That will be located at 700 North Alameda Street. Right next to Union Station is where that is.

At this point, I would like to thank the North Valley Coalition for helping us with regard to locating this particular room and coordinating closely with them with regard to insuring that everyone gets

copies of the various documents that we have.

The next slide is going to explain for you the essential components for the tentative proposed permit. The Tentative Permit limits the acceptable materials of the proposed landfill expansion to nonhazardous solid waste and your solid waste only.

Nonhazardous wastes are regular wastes, including garbage, trash, refuse, paper, rubbish, ashes, and that sort of thing. Inert wastes are uncontaminated soil, rock, concrete, and bricks.

Now, what cannot be accepted at the landfill? What is not permitted are things like hazardous waste, designated waste, special waste, such as foundry sand, and any waste that is not suitable to be discharged at a Class III Landfill or, I should say, placed in that landfill, such as -- sewage would be one example or sewage sludge.

Landfill operations: The Tentative Permit includes extensive requirements for site operations. The most important of these is requirements to keep an operating record, proper maintenance of the landfill, implementation of a waste-load-checking program, using appropriate daily covers, leachate collection and removal, and reporting to the Regional Board any noncompliance with the permit. There's a lot of very

specific requirements for operational landfill within our waste discharge or proposed permit.

With regard to the construction standards, it is part of the proposed expansion that would be constructed and operated in conformance with applicable Federal and State standards and will be equipped with a composite liner system. In some portions, liners will be constructed over the side slopes of the existing City Side Landfill. The final design construction plans must be reviewed and approved by the Federal board staff prior to installation. The seismic stability designs for the landfill that are submitted to the Regional Board are also reviewed by experts in the California Department of Water Resources.

Now, the next slide should be a graph of the area base liner system, and remember, the earlier photograph, where you saw that liner next to the trash. So this is what we're talking about here on the slide. We're giving you a cross section of what it looks like with that liner.

It includes, from bottom to top, a prepared base of bedrock, a compacted clay layer, a synthetic liner, as you can see by the blue line, a leachate drainage layer, and an operations layer.

The bedrock at Sunshine Canyon is

relatively impermeable and will provide additional protection with the groundwater beneath the landfill. The compacted clay liner is, at least, two feet thick and is composed of very permeable clay material, and the idea there is to provide a barrier for the downward migration of water or leachate through the landfill.

The synthetic liner is made of high-density polyethylene plastic, and this is a standard sort of liner that's used in landfills all across the country.

The leachate collection system is made of coarse gravel and pipelines and is designed to collect and remove any liquid at the bottom of the landfill.

So where you see the black circles there in the leachate collection system, what those are are, actually, pipes that would convey the leachate to the collection source. Now, the idea of this whole system is to ensure that -- the landfill will invariably create leachate, and the idea is for that leachate to be collected, be withdrawn from the landfill, actually, and then, you have these liners on the compacted clay, which is designed to ensure that none of that would go further.

Now, leachate is something that is generated in every landfill, and think of it as whatever you put in a landfill -- all the solid waste,

all the food waste, and whatever else is put in. It can break down. It may have water associated with it, and all that stuff, basically, mixes together, and that, in essence, is what the leachate is.

If you get any rainwater on top of that, flowing down into the landfill, that would mix as well, and the idea is really to get that out as it's being drained.

The operations layer is a layer of clean soil, at least, two feet thick, and that is used to protect the liner system from being damaged by heavy landfill equipment.

So the idea is -- as you have the waste on the landfill, you, then, are putting soil covered over that immediately, and that allows the tractors and bulldozers, that sort of thing, over it without harming the landfill.

THE AUDIENCE: Can I ask a question?

MR. DICKERSON: We're going to have questions later.

Now, the next line is a double-liner system. There we are. This slide demonstrates the double-liner system that is used to construct the leachate sumps at the landfill. The sump is part of the liner system.

What we're talking about here is -- as the leachate is flowing downhill, it's going to flow to a low point in the landfill, and it's designed that way so that the leachate can be collected at a low point and, then, removed up out of the system.

So what you have here is a portion within a landfill area that actually gets additional protection for that leachate material from, potentially, going into the ground.

So you have here -- at the bottom of this area, would be a sump, and it would be the size of a home swimming pool, where leachate pumps are installed, and it's at the lowest point of the landfill where it's collected and removed, and really, it's one of the most critical parts of a landfill system. You want to make sure that your leachate collection system is working well, and it's designed well.

One of the most important aspects of this, really, is that you can see there -- you have the two blue lines. That's that synthetic liner that we talked about before. Here you have two of those, and in between, you have a clay liner, a specially designed and compacted clay liner, that is designed, really, to ensure with extra measure that any leachate left wouldn't go through that or would go very, very slow.

That gives you a photograph of how that looks@ÒÜ@äÊÂØÒèò\@@¤ÊÚÊÚÄÊäX@òÞê@æÂî@èÐÂè@æòÜèÐÊèÒÆ••••@@@@@@@@@@f@ØÒÜÊä@ÌäÞÚ@èÐÊ@ÞèÐÊä@àÐÞèÞÎäÂàÐ@ÊÂäØÒÊä@ÞÜ\@@¦Þ@èÐÒæ@Òæ••••@@@@@@@@@@h@îÐÂè@Òè@ØÞÞÖæ@ØÒÖÊ@Ìêäè ÐÊä@ÈÞîÜ@Âæ@òÞê@ÐÂìÊ@èÐÊ••••@@@@@@@@@@j@ÞàÊäÂèÒÞÜæ@ØÂòÊä@àØÂÆÊÈ@ÞÜ@èÞà@ÞÌ@ÒèX@Â ÜÈ@Âè@èÐÊ••••@@@@@@@@@@l@ÄÞèèÞÚX@òÞê@æÊÊ@èÐÊ@ØÊÂÆÐÂèÊ@ÆÞØØÊÆèÒÞÜ@ØÂòÊäX@ÂÜÈ@èÐÂè ••••@@@@@@@@@@n@îÞêØÈ@ÄÊ@Âè@èÐÊ@ØÞî@àÞÒÜèX@îÐÊäÊ@òÞê@ÂäÊ@ÜÞî@ÆÞØØÊÆèÒÜÎ••••@@@@@ @@@@@p@ØÊÂÆÐÂèÊ@èÞ@ÐÂìÊ@Òè@êæÊÈ@ÒÜ@èÐÊ@ØÂÜÈÌÒØØ\••••@@@@@@@@@@r@@@@@@@@@@@@@œÞîX @èÐÊäÊNæ@Â@ØÞè@ÞÌ@ÚÞÜÒèÞäÒÜÎ@èÐÂè@Îßes

on to ensure the landfill is operating correctly, and the next slide indicates to you the current monitoring that will be required.

At this particular proposed landfill, there would be 10 groundwater monitoring wells and one groundwater extraction trench. Water samples will be regularly analyzed for a full range of pollutants that may be expected at the landfill.

Besides groundwater monitoring, BFI will also be required to monitor leachate, surface water, subdrain water, and landfill gas at the site.

The next slide shows you the location of these proposed monitoring wells, and this is, actually, in addition to the existing monitoring network. Red dots represent ground monitoring wells, and we see those there.

Now, take note that where MW-10 is located. We're going to come back and talk about that in greater detail. MW-10 is monitoring all 10. It's so easy for those of us involved in the technical matters like this to lapse into our technical jargon. So, please, excuse me.

There is, also, a groundwater extraction trench that was constructed across the canyon bottom to intercept groundwater flow. You see that with that blue line. You have to think of this as a canyon, really, that's being filled up with trash. So as the water would be flowing down, it would flow down past that trench, and the idea of that trench is really to serve as yet an additional barrier, a mechanism by which leachate could be identified, collected, and removed from going any further downhill.

Let's talk a little bit about some of the known groundwater problems that we know about at the site. There are several known groundwater contaminations or possible contamination issues at the site that are being evaluated. This includes the potential low-level volatile organic compounds. We call those VOCs, and this is at one of the down-gradient groundwater monitoring wells at the City Side Landfill and in the subdrain water at the County

Extension Landfill.

Here we have high concentrations of dissolved solids, which we refer to as TDS. That would include chloride, sulfate, and some other inorganic constituents in the groundwater. VOCs or volatile organic compounds are a group of organic compounds that are commonly detected in landfill leachate and landfill gas, but these do not, normally, exist in uncontaminated groundwater.

If you find any of these VOCs in any of the groundwater monitoring wells, it's a very good indicator that you may have a landfill that's leaking.

On the other hand, TDS is a chemical that is always detected at various levels of groundwater, but it's the kind of thing that's commonly found, that's naturally found, in groundwater.

So the question becomes whether or not the concentrated levels that are found of that total dissolved solids are something that's above background, or it should be background itself. Some of it has to be evaluated.

VOCs are inactive at City Side Landfill. Remember, Monitoring Well 10. That's a shallow groundwater monitoring well at the toe of the unlined City Side Landfill. It's approximately 180 feet from

the footprint of the landfill. The well was installed in 1993. Since 1994, low levels of several volatile organic compounds have been detected at the well.

Now, that has been investigated by the Regional Board, and the investigation concluded that the volatile organic compounds were the result of landfill gas impacts to groundwater.

In response, BFI repaired and upgraded the gas collection system at the landfill in 1997. Since 1997, both the frequency and the magnitude of the VOC detection at the well have been significantly reduced due to the corrective action measures that were taken.

Since January 2000, only one volatile organic carbon compound has been detected, and its concentrations have been consistently less than the maximum contaminant level. That's one of the standards that we apply to groundwater, and that's, actually, something that's found in drinking water.

So if it's below the level, it would be allowed in drinking water. No VOCs or volatile organic compounds or have been detected and confirmed at any other groundwater wells on the site. You remember those other groundwater wells you saw on the site. There weren't any of those found in them.

Now, let's take a look at the active County

Extension Landfill area. The Extension -- that's the active site where the waste is currently being collected. That's equipped with a composite liner system. Beneath the liner, a subdrain system has been installed to collect shallow seepage and spring waters that were encountered during the construction of the landfill.

The water collected in the subdrain system is discharged through several pipeline outlets to a sediment basin that drains off site. In early 2001, high concentrations of methane and hydrogen sulfite were detected at the subdrain outlets.

Subsequent analyses detected VOCs in the water, discharged from the subdrain outlets. Concentrations of VOC are all lower than the drinking water maximum contaminant levels. The VOCs in the subdrain water are also believed to be caused by landfill gas.

As required, BFI has diverted the subdrain water to the on-site leachate treatment facility and, then, reusing it for dust control in the landfill since May of 2001. So it's not being discharged. It's staying on land.

Meanwhile, BFI has taken action to remove gas from the subdrain system, which has subsequently

reduced concentrations of gases at the subdrain outlets, as well as the volatile organic compounds in the subdrain water.

I'll talk a little bit about TDS, and I'm almost finished. High levels of inorganic constituents, such as total dissolved solids -- and these can be things like chlorides, sulfate, sodium, and calcium (salts) -- have been found in groundwater samples from Sunshine Canyon, especially at the down-gradient wells.

For example, TDS concentrations in groundwater from the Sunshine Canyon range from 1,000 to 4,000 milligrams per liter, while the maximum concentration level of drinking water for taste is 500 milligrams per liter.

We believe that the high levels of inorganic constituents are not likely caused by the landfill because of several reasons. First, the marine sedimentary rocks at the site can produce water with a high TDS. So it's a naturally occurring situation in rocks of this kind that can create TDS concentrations or total dissolved solid concentrations in groundwater.

Secondly, volatile organic carbon compounds, the most direct evidence of landfill impact, have not been detected except for the Monitoring Well

10 that we talked about earlier. Thirdly, stable isotope analysis showed no relationship between groundwater and landfill leachate.

Nevertheless, we do not completely exclude the possibility that some organic constituent may have been released from the landfill to groundwater. However, because the groundwater in the area is naturally high in salts, the relatively higher salt concentrations, which are down-gradient of the landfill, do not significantly impact the beneficial uses of that groundwater.

Next I'd like to turn to a brief discussion of some of the radioactive test results that have been done at the landfill. There have been concerns raised about the issue of radioactive waste being accepted by Class III landfills in the past.

Neither City Side Landfill nor the County Extension Landfill have been permitted to receive radioactive wastes, and there is no evidence currently existing that indicates that any radioactive waste has knowingly been accepted at the landfill.

BFI implements a load-checking program at the site to screen and reject any unacceptable waste, including radioactive substances. Even so, small objects that contain low levels of radioactive

substances, such as exit signs, old watches, fire extinguishers, and other kinds of similar materials may get into the landfill. So these small objects are not expected to cause significant environmental problems at the landfill.

I would like to digress just a minute and indicate there's lots of concerns about waste coming from other facilities, and the content of those are regulated by the Department of Health Services.

So it's really, regularly -- how do I put this? -- high level -- or whatever you call low-level radioactive waste will not be allowed there in the landfill. If some -- power provides some small, residual level of radioactivity associated with it, such as it was not defined as being radioactive any longer, it's possible some of that material in the past may have gone to the landfill. Currently, though, there are monitors placed in the groundwater at this point.

Now, groundwater sampling is not the basis of the decision to form Sunshine Canyon Landfill. It was organized this past year by the State Water Resources Control Board, and various analytical data was collected for this and other landfills in the area.

It indicated that the current concentration

of accepted radioactive species of groundwater at the site are all over the drinking water maximum contamination levels, and that's in groundwater. A little bit different for the leaching, but you would expect that, given that leachate is less than all the material from the landfill.

There is a required corrective action program associated with the proposed permit that we have. BFI would be required to continue upgrading and adjusting the landfill gas collection system at the site to eliminate the impact of landfill gas to groundwater. To minimize the potential for off-site migration of contaminants through the shallow groundwater zone, BFI would be also required to upgrade the existing groundwater extraction trench at the site and construct a cutoff wall south of the canyon.

The cutoff wall will be located down-gradient of Monitoring Wall 10 and the area where volatile organic carbon compounds have been detected and up-gradient of the landfill's property boundary.

The cutoff wall will be keyed to the bedrock and completely cut off shallow groundwater flow from the canyon. Because of low permeability of bedrock at the site, possibility of pollutants being released to the water resources outside the canyon,

once that was put in place, would be extremely low, once that shallow groundwater flow is completely cut off.

It's also important to note that additional corrective actions may be required at any point in the future and ordered by the Regional Board.

So let me conclude by saying the following:

The Tentative Permit, as developed by Regional Board staff, was done after a very thorough and careful review of documentation that we have before us, and the staff believes that it is a permit that would protect the water resources of the State.

Comments from the public and the dischargers will be considered and presented to the Regional Board, and that will modify the Tentative Permit to address those comments. Our normal process is to get comments back. We propose a document like the Tentative WDR, and we encourage everyone to send us comments as to anything within that document they would like to see changed or that they think is inaccurate or improper.

Regional Board staff, then, will review those comments and prepare a very detailed response to those. It's very often, really, that we, on the basis of the comments we receive, will make changes to a

proposed tentative basis that's required. At that time, we take that change to the Regional Board for their consideration. That's the process that we have in place.

The public hearing, as I noted earlier, before the board is scheduled for July 24th, and the board will consider all comments and testimony, including the testimony that we hear today and this evening, and we'll consider whether or not to adopt, adopt with revision, or continue the matter for a future meeting or not to adopt it at all.

At this point, I would just like to acknowledge the work of our staff who have been developing this document and helping out today and in leading up to this matter.

Paula Rasmussen. Paula, would you stand up, please. Paula heads up our landfill unit and our horsemen's area as well.

Rod Nelson. Rod is the chief of our landfill unit, and Wayne Yang is our chief technical staff member responsible for developing the document.

So with that now, I'll turn this back over to Susan Cloke.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you, Mr. Dickerson. Before we start taking testimony, I

would like to introduce some of the political offices that are represented today.

Assemblyman Keith Richards' office is represented, and Mr. Gary Washburn is here.

Gary, do you want to -- and Gary is going to testify, which is why he's coming up. I also want to introduce Kim Thompson.

Miss Thompson, could you stand up so we could see who you are. Thank you.

Miss Thompson is from the city of Los Angeles Environmental Affairs Commission.

Is there anybody else representing an elected officer or city of -- good. Great. Lots of people. Would you mind standing up?

MR. DODDER: Bob Dodder, Senior Deputy to Supervisor to Mike Antonovich, in charge of landfill operations.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Are you intending to speak today, sir?

MR. DODDER: I am, yes.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Okay. How about you?

(Inaudible) (No mic)

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Is there anyone else?

So seeing no one else, welcome to you. Welcome to everybody, and our first speaker will be

Mr. Washburn.

MR. WASHBURN: Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to provide some input from Assemblyman Richman. My name is Gary Washburn, W-a-s-h-b-u-r-n, and I'm the senior district director for California State Assemblyman Keith Richman, M.D.

Dr. Richman has represented this area since 2000, this area being Granada Hills, and we have the Northwest San Fernando Valley and the Sunshine Canyon --

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Can people hear? Not very well.

(Off-the-record discussion)

MR. WASHBURN: But anyway, I represent Dr. Richman, and our district does include the Sunshine Canyon in its entirety. So it's been an issue both when I worked previously for Assemblywoman Paula Bowla 10 years ago, and it's still an issue in the community due to the environmental factors for a number of reasons.

What I'd like to do today, to expedite matters, is to read into the record a letter that we have provided on March, the 28th, to the Army Corps of Engineers pertaining to the same topic, pertaining to the same permit, and basically, the letter goes as

follows, and this will be followed up with a letter, some additional comments, from Dr. Richman that will be sent to you.

"I wish to State my opposition to the permit being requested by Browning Ferris Industries of California for the construction of flood control facilities and the placement of a liner to dispose of the waste material associated with the Sunshine Canyon Landfill Extension Project.

"It is my view that the permit should be denied, based on both environmental factors and the negative impact that the Sunshine Canyon Landfill has long had on the community and on the proximity of the Sunshine Canyon landfill to a vital water supply serving millions of Metropolitan Water District customers and the Van Norman Reservoir. The community has long contended that the water supply for millions of residents is at risk -- and we believe the same thing -- and the expansion of the landfill would further endanger our residents.

"As the representative of the Granada Hills community in the California State Assembly, I join with the North Valley Coalition" -- and other community groups -- "in opposing the granting of this permit," and that's signed Keith S. Richman, M.D., member of the

assembly for the 38th District.

Thank you very much for the input, and Dr. Richman will be providing additional correspondence to additional data to your office prior to the July 24th hearing.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you. We look forward to it. Thank you very much, Mr. Washburn.

Our next speaker is Mr. John Maddox.

Mr. Maddox, are you here? Have I got the name right?

MR. MADDOX: I just represent myself.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: That's what we're here for, but everybody wants to hear you.

MR. MADDOX: My question is: What if the experts are wrong that were presented here today? What if the protections are inadequate? What will be the short-term/long-term consequences? If you'll permit me an analogy, the CIA and military experts of America were wrong about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction or, at least, mildly inadequate.

And so the question I have here is: What are the arguable consequences, the site being on an earthquake site? I think everybody knows that near the water aquifer, where contamination risks are, probably, is the largest site with regard to supplying water to

the largest metropolitan area, not only the city of Los Angeles, but Southern California Metropolitan Water District.

I'd like to give you some arguable consequences, at least. Economic losses, I think, would be to the permitters and the permittees, similar to losses in tort litigation. The earlier cases with regard to asbestos issues, that is to say, landfill use with refuse disposal, is very sexy right now, and asbestos was very sexy for fire prevention at one time, and everybody said got to have it, and they're saying now we got to have it with regard to refuse disposal.

Second point: Loss of the economy to the region is an arguable thing, loss of potential business growth. For example, look at what happened to the airline industry when everybody was "Ah, what's going to happen here?"

And with regard to French Quebec, when they said everybody has to be able to speak French to be here -- when you have uncertainty about something as important as water to an issue here, if the water becomes contaminated.

Another issue is the health cost to society. I have my family and my son's family living in the Washington, D.C., area, and just a little

anthrax scare or a terrorism scare, really, got the society around Washington, D.C., in a big scuttle.

So the question is: What would happen here in the health process to society with regard to fear if the water contamination became an issue here? I can't tell you what happens when the scare gets out, fear gets out, on something like that.

And the fourth issue is moral issues. I hope there is a morality in society today. Morality issues are about all kinds of things -- water contamination issues, if there is water contamination from the site, and that would be -- the political fallout. I hope nobody is unconcerned about that.

So I come back to the major issue, and that is: What if the experts are wrong? Don't tell me the experts cannot be wrong because we've seen here in a case of Federal -- supposed to be the best in the world, and the fallout for America is not limited. It's not limited.

And the same thing could be the case here for America, probably, the biggest metropolitan area in the United States, and this is a very, very serious issue about water contamination, and I don't think it's something that can just be passed over, and I ask you -- this is a very serious issue, and I hope it will

be very seriously discussed.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you very much, Mr. Maddox.

Miss Becky Bendikson.

And after Miss Bendikson, we'll have Miss Edwards.

MS. BENDIKSON: My name is Becky Bendikson, and I'm the chairperson of the north neighboring council. Our neighborhood council, compromised of, approximately, 28,000 residents, is very concerned about the impact of the Sunshine Canyon Landfill on our community, as well as the millions of persons in the city and county of Los Angeles who rely on the water supply located here.

The testimony I'd like to provide now is from my personal experience. I am a 13-year resident of the community of Granada Hills.

Toxics are found in everyday trash, everything from (inaudible) household cleaners, even illegally disposed of chemicals. The list is endless. The city and county will generate substantial amounts of toxins in excess of 20,000 tons per year.

Along with a leachate (inaudible), again, a potential for the contamination of the groundwater and the closeness to the water supply, the Regional Water

Quality Control Board of the Los Angeles region needs to ensure that under no circumstances with the future of Los Angeles water, indeed, the water for much of Southern California will be placed in peril.

We know that BFI has had problems with the county with a torn liner and methane in the underdrain collection system. We know that they have received over 91 violations since September 1999. We are told that they are one of the most cited landfills in California.

This, along with their past violations, when operating the now closed City Landfill, should be a warning to all that they cannot be trusted. The cumulative effects of the four landfills must be considered. What four, you ask?

The first City Landfill consists of an unlined southern portion, number one; a separate unlined northern section, number two; plus the existing lined County Landfill, number three; and finally, the proposed city expansion, number four, which is also proposed to be lined.

Oh, yes. And did I mention that BFI has proposed a 215-million-ton super dump? -- possibly, one of the largest in the world -- and that these phases are just part of their overall plan, a plan that is

known to you, the Water Board, and that, because of the potential cumulative impacts, they must be addressed now. Not later.

We are not impressed or reassured when a DAILY NEWS article, dated June 16, 2003, quotes Mr. Rod Nelson, the Water Board Senior Engineer, overseeing landfills in the (unaudible) being found in the on-site monitor wells, stating that "The problem isn't unusual."

Personally, I find the fact that the RWQCB finds water contamination of landfills the norm extremely distressing. In other words, the regulations, the controls, the condition, the testing, et cetera -- all the things that you ask of the proponent will not protect the water.

The fact that the Balboa end tunnel is so close to the mouth of the Sunshine Canyon and that surface water goes to ground in the treatment and storage area for water for millions of people through unlined sections of the county (inaudible) channel should raise a flag for the RWQCB that they are gambling on the future of our children.

At the very least, the Water Board should require that a double-liner system be installed. The RWQCB should also consider requiring off-site

monitoring wells outside of the land well entrance between the mouth of the canyon and Balboa and the tunnel to the east.

On behalf of the community, I also request that your board establish and maintain a Web site, posting in a timely fashion the results of all water testing and any violations concerning the water that all of the city of Los Angeles, the neighboring council, and the public in general can be kept informed of this most important information. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you very much.

MS. EDWARDS: I'm Mary Edwards, and I represent the North Valley Coalition, and it seems like I've been doing this forever which, indeed, I think I have. The first WDRs were really a result of the fact that they did not have them in place back in the '80s, and our coalition said, "What are you doing about the water?"

And they said, "Well, we look. If we see any leachate, we will report it, but we haven't seen any." We didn't think that that was sufficient, (inaudible) and WDRs were prepared for the old site.

So we feel that, through this process, we have learned a lot about what does and doesn't happen with these facilities. First, I want to ask -- this is

a question I'm going to ask for an answer from your staff.

When different permits conflict, as they do, there are certain prescriptions in the city and the county to do different things. Which prevails?

Is it the more stringent or, in the case of the Water Board, will allow things that the city would not allow? I need to know which one will prevail in these circumstances because we've often been told that after we fought very hard for mitigation -- "oh, well, no. You're overruled by" --

Now, we need to know what prevails. Because I was told once by Rod Nelson that the most stringent will prevail, but it's all of this that we've been going through to get mitigation -- just a travesty from the city, asking for daily covers and things like that, because another permit at the State level will override it. We really, really need to have that.

You referred to a double liner. Now, is that the same kind of liner that is required in a Class II landfill, or you're just saying it's double protection? Because we feel that a double liner is absolutely warranted because of the amount -- by the sheer volume, the amount of toxins going into that landfill would in other circumstances qualify it as a

Class II landfill because it's not that they are intentionally put there, but the waste treatment is so high, and now we're dealing with E waste, too, which is a new factor, and it is a tremendously devastating factor because there's no way that at the present time there's any place to put the E waste.

Also, I'm really concerned about the self-monitoring aspects of this. Self-monitoring seems to me like allowing drivers on the freeway to set their own speed and keep a log at the end of the day. No, please.

I think we need to have monitoring in there that is run by the State on, at least, a yearly basis, but these things should be overseen by laboratories.

Unfortunately, I have learned through sad experience that not everyone with a lot of letters after their names or certified this and that are necessarily not for sale. They are probably listed on E Bay, as far as I know.

I'm really disturbed by the fact that so often I have very skeptical and differing results. So we think the State should definitely have a role to play in seeing, at least, that there is an oversight by an independent monitoring agency, and that means not hired by the proponent.

We, also, are a little disturbed that everyone says that this is not beneficial water. Well, from what I was hearing today, I'm going to go out and buy bottled water from now on, if what I was hearing -- some of those constituents, like hydrogen sulfur -- these are not okay.

I think you're going to have a problem with MW-10 because of the fact that there could be a pluming, and it says that they don't believe at this point that the plume has left the site, but unless you have off-site wells to pick that up -- and I don't see any in your proposals -- I think that would be serious and can compromise.

Also, as we pointed out with the liner, you know that you have terrible problems with existing liners. So unless it's upgraded -- because they've already -- and we were told, "Oh, this liner is going to last forever." Well, it lasted what? About six, seven years, and now it's ruptured, and it's leaking into the subdrain.

So now we have a problem if the liner is not upgraded. We also have a problem if not considering the site as one whole unit because we should have a WDR for the entire landfill and not separate them because the CERs that separate them do

not make two separate landfills, and they share separate treatment facilities. They share joint incineration, where the flares are. So many of the actual ancillary activities are shared.

So we feel it should be a shared WDR where you are allowed to consider the problems in the upper canyon, the county canyon, at this point, and that should be taken into consideration because this is generated within the community.

The discharge has generated a nuisance on Whistler Avenue and places like that, and they came out to investigate it and thought it came from when they discharged into the sewer because they can't now -- it's really incorrect in your Tentative WDR to say it's going into the creek. The creek was dried up because that water was contaminated, and they had to put it into the sewer.

That itself caused problems. So it should be treated under one document that addresses the entire project. We are, also, really worried about the use of green waste on site because you notice one of the constituents that was being found in high concentrations was ammonia, and we know that ammonia is generated by green waste, and there are many green waste facilities in that area, and we know that this

would -- and your acceptance of use.

It looks real benign, but things like manure and things can generate some of the things you're going to get -- are great producers of ammonia, and since it's already high, we think you should prohibit the acceptance of green waste.

Now, I could go on because I'm really worried about the fact that closure has not been done on parts that you're permitting, and the city demands that closure be completed on the parts -- on the landfill, and that was required in 1991, but it's taken all this time. Because when you put the infrastructure for the expansion, they delayed it for all those years.

So now we have a situation where that portion of the landfill has not been properly closed, and yet the plans come back into an area where trash and closure has not taken place, and we think that that is absolutely unacceptable.

So, you know, I know that we need -- I need, at least, a lot more time to go over this in detail, and I would hope that we would be able to meet with you or, at least, submit voluminous amounts of material on our rebuttal because I do have some suggestions today on some of our points.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you, Mrs. Edwards,

for your comments.

Let me just say to you that we would be happy to receive specific written comments and suggestions. What the staff will do is to list these comments in a matrix and provide the staff answers so that the board can understand what your suggestions were, what the staff response was.

Remember, that this hearing today is to collect testimony for the board's consideration, but it's, also, as Mr. Dickerson said, an opportunity for people to make comments which often become the basis for revisions to the Tentative Permit, as staff presents it to the board.

So there are two different parts here to your comments today. One part is that staff will look at them and will adopt them or will explain why they haven't, or we'll adopt them in whole or in part, and the second portion is that the board members will receive that information, and it will be clear to us, sitting on the board, what the public testimony was and what the staff response was.

Now, we would appreciate any written documents that you want to submit.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I would also like to know where we can comment on the 401 Permit. Is that

through this that that's being considered separately?

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Yes. But it's through our agency.

THE AUDIENCE: Will that come up for any kind of public hearing -- the 401?

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: I'm going to ask Mr. Dickerson to put that on his list of questions. Usually, what we find is that many people have similar questions, and then, we try to group them and answer them all. Thank you for your testimony.

Okay. We, actually, do have a time limit. You, probably, noticed that I just felt that Mrs. Edwards, with her historical knowledge and her stature in the community, needed to have a little extra time. So, please, if somebody has already said what you wanted to say, let us know that you agree, but try to stay within the time limit, if you can.

I do want to make sure that you do have a full opportunity to speak today because we will not be taking up, you know, four hours for public testimony during the Board Meeting.

Our next speaker is going to be Mr. Cote, and after Mr. Cote, Mr. Edwards.

MS. COTE: Surprise. I'm a girl.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: I thought Darrac --

MS. COTE: It was my dad's name, and I got it.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: We need to put "Ms." in front of it.

MS. COTE: I think so. Can you hear me?

Good afternoon. My name is Darrac Cote. I live in Granada Hills, and I have a deep concern about the eventual contamination of the L.A. water supply, if the proposed expansion puts one of the largest landfills in this country next to one of the largest water reservoirs and treatment facilities in the United States.

I have in my hand a geological map of the Los Angeles region. It outlines where the earthquake faults are located and, in this case, specifically, where the thrust faults are located.

To any resident of Granada Hills, looking at this map, it's a shocker. I'm going to say it again. It's a shocker. Ironically, in the whole Los Angeles area, the greatest proliferation of thrust faults lie directly at the base of the Santa Susana Mountains behind Northridge and Granada Hills.

The number of thrust faults in the area, again, is shocking. We all recall the horrific 1994 Northridge earthquake. It leveled the overpass on

Highway 14 and the 5 Freeway right in the area adjacent to the landfills.

Here are the facts of my concern: The old city dump is unlined. The city expansion will depend on a liner placed over an unstable mess, subject to settlement. What will happen if one of the thrust faults located right in the area becomes active? Will the liner split and leak? Maybe cancer-causing carcinogens into the groundwater and reservoir, eventually, ending up in the L.A. water supply.

If this were to happen, I have a question to you and the board. Are you prepared to answer to the entire population of Los Angeles that, in light of these facts, along with the facts of concerns presented to you by my fellow residents, you, knowingly, went ahead and gave the okay for the expansion.

However, we trust that you share the same deep concerns to keep the L.A. water supply as pure and clean as we do. And so, as a community, we look to you and your board to do the right thing and say no to the expansion.

I would like to give you some copies of this California geological map that very clearly localizes the active thrust fault area in proximity to the L.A. water supply and the landfills. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you.

Mr. Edwards.

MR. EDWARDS: My name is Dave Edwards. I'm the project director for the Sunshine Canyon property. I'm here with members of our team to answer any questions that the board or board staff may have regarding the project. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you, Mr. Edwards.

The next person will be Mr. Rickett. Did I do that right?

MR. RICKETTS: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: With an "s" on the end of it, sir?

MR. RICKETTS: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: And after him, Mr. Ralph Kroy.

MR. RICKETTS: I'm Robert Ricketts. I'm a neighbor of the Metropolitan Water District and representative of the Knollwood Property Owners' Association. Our area, north fence, is common with the area where the Water District's plant and all of the reclamation and treatment facilities are and that, as a group, we are very concerned with what could happen.

Mary and Becky and all the people have done an excellent job of summarizing the details of our

concerns. I think that we need to look at the big picture. My training was in engineering, and as I was growing up, I was constantly amazed that California had the capability of handling big projects.

The water districts have brought water to Southern California. They've brought electricity to California, created some of the largest projects in the world, and we've ended up with two of them, the largest water treatment plant and the largest dump right next to each other.

Big problems require big solutions. I think, in summary of everything today, is finding a solution that solves this, and I think the first step is the rejection of the expansion at the Sunshine Canyon dump. I'd be glad to add any additional information, but I think that summarizes our whole problem, and that's a place to start.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you, Mr. Ricketts.

And after Mr. Kroy, Mr. Rennwald.

MR. KROY: Thank you. I'm presenting this in opposition of those who drink the water --

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Mr. Kroy, it's the same problem.

MR. KROY: I'm presenting this in

opposition on behalf of those who drink the water of the Los Angeles Metropolitan Water District, approximately, 17 million customers.

The water treatment plant is located one-half mile downstream from the Sunshine Canyon Landfill near, really, where we're doing this testimony. Not too far.

We challenge you now to support the environmental public safety, environmental justice, quality partnership, and service of the people here.

We're talking about the people living here now and in the future and for generations to come. The board's attention is directed the following considerations and review: The landfill is located, approximately -- in close proximity to the following:

The Jensen Water Treatment plant, providing water to, approximately, 17 million customers all over Southern California, Van Gogh Elementary School, a neighborhood of homes, families, and children, O'Melveny Park, the second largest park in the city of Los Angeles, between the busy 5 and 14 interchange, premiere interchange. One of California's most seismically active areas in the windy mountain pass, the 5 passes through, connecting Los Angeles with the cities to the north.

The landfill, as proposed, will be one of the largest landfills in the country, almost across the street and over 200 feet above the largest water treatment plants in the United States.

The pioneers, those that survived, knew enough not to put the outhouse near the drinking water. The newer landfill does not have a liner. The newer parts do. The landfill is one of California's most seismically active areas, as witnessed by the 1971 and 1994 earthquakes, and the severe damage that was done to the freeway interchange across the street from the landfill.

The mountains went up about 18 inches in each of these quakes. The expectation that a thin plastic liner could survive the onslaught of Mother Nature's extreme force is a stretch, bordering on negligent.

The landfill operation presently has a record of 92 violations. The nearby Simi Valley Landfill and Recycling Center in Ventura in the same period had none, zero. This is the record of BFI today.

The liners are now waiting. All liners leak, according to Ruckelhaus, former EPA head and former BFI president.

The questions are: 30 years after BFI is done, who's going to man the pumps? For how long and at what cost, and when does leachate get into the water supply, and of course, how do we mitigate this?

We're counting on your common sense, intelligent analysis, and commitment to your duty as a citizen of the State to not approve the expansion of the Sunshine Canyon Landfill. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you, Mr. Kroy.

Mr. Rennwald. And after Mr. Rennwald, Ms. Libis.

MR. RENNWALD: My name is Fred Rennwald, and I'm not going to talk about liners in the dump, but Mr. Dickerson, I'd like to let you know that I've lived here for 47 years in this same area walking distance from here. I used to pick oranges where you're sitting. I grew up here.

I worked for Mr. O'Melveny at O'Melveny Ranch. I worked for Gene Autry. They had a school there from St. Vincent De Paul, and I used to work there during the summer, and I used to walk up Bee Canyon, and I used to see a creek run down the canyon.

The creek's gone. The creek's dry. I was just there this afternoon. I took some pictures. I was trying to take some water samples, and in my

profession, I deal with water quality, and I'm going to take some water samples, and I'd like to send them to you for a report of those water samples myself.

I'm very concerned with the community because I've been here for many years, and I'm involved with a lot of things in the community, a lot of volunteerism.

You mentioned a few things that I want to bring up right now. I can't go on with my history. I'd like to talk about some comments you made. You said that the leach water is used to keep the dust down on the landfill.

As a matter of fact, I know that landfill very well, the old one, the city one, because I used to travel up the backside of that hill from where the area was for the Boys' Club and for Mr. O'Melveny, and we used to dump in that landfill.

From the park side, there was a road to the top, and I watched it fill right from the very beginning. I'm concerned about the frogs that aren't in the creek and the creek that does not run and where it runs to, and what happened to the other creek that used to be along Old Balboa Road? There was a dirt road up to there.

When we were young kids out here, we didn't

have much to do. We had to look for work wherever we could. We helped cut down all the lemon trees all over this area, and we brought a lot of those to the dump. I had a lot of trips to the dump, and I saw what they did in the old city dump, and everything went into that dump. Everything.

I was concerned with the flood about 10 years ago that wiped out that whole creek area, and it uprooted some unusual-looking huge, plastic pipes out of that creek back up in O'Melveny Park heading towards the original City Landfill.

Somebody should look into that and find out why there are giant, huge plastic pipes coming out from that landfill, heading down to a creek that's no longer there now, and that only happened because it was uprooted from a heavy rainstorm.

You mentioned you used leach water to put on top of the dust at this landfill. I'm concerned about that, and I think you should be. Trucks travel over that leached water. It's creating dust, and it blows right down on my house, and I don't think that's appropriate.

Also, the radioactivity is monitored by BFI. I think that that's in error on your part, sir. That should be monitored by a separate agency. Also,

there's an area down below where you're going to catch some of the leach water into a reservoir area or a drain.

I think that you should monitor the water that heads down into a natural area or what used to be Bee Canyon Creek, or I used to call it Bull Creek because there were a lot of bullfrogs. I haven't seen a frog in years. I think you should consider the fact the citizens sitting in this room are long-time citizens that have been up in that area and have sought change over the years and are very concerned right now.

All of the other things that were mentioned are good ideas, but when I go to the park now, I don't see what I used to see at all, and I'm afraid -- you were talking -- the gentleman just before me mentioned generations from now.

I think you really need to think about what's going to happen generations from now, and I hope it doesn't look like the 47 years that have passed added to another 47 years and maybe a dump right down on Rinaldi Street.

Because if there's another big rainstorm, I can guarantee you that a part of that dump is going to come down through O'Melveny Park, and it's going to come into those homes. You wait and see. Because I

know how thin that wall was that I drove that truck over into that original landfill 47 years ago, and I think you should look into that.

Thank you very much.

And where could I send these water samples?

MR. DICKERSON: We'll respond to that question later, but I'd like to speak with you personally about that.

MR. KROY: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Mrs. Libis. And after Mrs. Libis -- I have two final cards. One from Ms. Ziliak.

MS. LIBIS: I do not drink city water. I do not cook with city water. I only use the city water for doing my dishes and my laundry. My husband died from cancer.

I live in a cul-de-sac, approximately, 20 homes, and nine people have died already from some kind of cancer. There has never been an independent health survey made in all these years. The surveys that have been made have had BFI present.

Now I'll speak in general. I am tired of politics. I am tired of greed. I am tired of the chicanery that has been involved with this dump. I am against any permit that permits this dump to keep

existing. Frankly, I feel the only consideration should be the public, here and now, that's involved, as well as our future generations.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you, Mrs. Libis. I have two cards remaining, one from Ms. Ziliak and one from Mr. Hilberg.

Is there anyone who hasn't submitted a card who wishes to speak?

Okay. As I understand it, Ms. Ziliak and Mr. Hilberg were not here when we administered the oath.

So anybody wishing to speak now, if you will all stand, just the people who wish to testify, raise your right hand.

Audience participants of the Los Angeles Water Board Meeting, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you very much.

Now, Ms. Ziliak, if you'll come up. So these will be our final five speakers. At the end of these final five speakers, we will take a five-minute break because we do have to take care of our court reporter who has been very patient with us, and then,

we'll get back here, and Mr. Dickerson will respond to some of the questions you raised today from the staff point of view. Okay.

Welcome, Ms. Ziliak.

MS. ZILIAK: A lot of testimony has been given on seismic activity. However, I think there's a few things that I'd like to add to it.

First of all, there are three comments or statements that were made. The first one was from the Los Angeles Department of Public Works, talking about the Santa Susana faults. They say the Santa Susana faults are associated with the seismically active zone of north-dipping thrust faults. The recency of seismic activities suggests that the entire zone may be active, including the Santa Susana Fault.

That's very important because I believe some comments were made that stated that the area of the expansion wasn't near any of those fault lines, and I thought that wasn't right. People have commented from public sources by Public Works that that's true, the Santa Susana faults can be activity (inaudible).

The other comment was from the California Division of Mines and Geology, and they say the uplift of the Santa Susana Mountains has occurred during the late halcyon time. I've been thinking that this has to

be looked into.

So many people have commented on it, and geologists have looked at it. David Jensen, an engineer geologist, said that the site slid just northwest of the Santa Susana Fault and, thereby, is on the upper plate of a large active thrust fault so that Santa Susana is known to be an active fault and known to be halcyon.

It has the capability of experiencing the 1972 earthquake, and given the fact that the existing landfill in the county has a liner and has already ripped leads me to worry now this new design may not be able to withstand the capability of another earthquake, and I've lived here through two earthquakes.

I grew up here, and all around that landfill, the bridges went down. The freeways went down. The school was destroyed. Houses were destroyed that still have not been rebuilt.

So I'm thinking that more needs to be done about this, and we have to consider the safety in the community when we're talking about a minor system. Obviously, what's there isn't good enough. It still rips, and I don't think that will last through an earthquake. So we are going to propose one for the city. We should definitely look at that liner system

very carefully. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you, Ms. Ziliak.

Mr. Hilberg.

MR. HILBERG: The first issue I want to bring up is one that was not brought up -- surface water. When it rains hard, the water is not going to go through down to the pipes. It is going to run down the side of the hill, and we're not sure where that is.

The second issue is airborne particles, airborne particles. Since I've retired, I have been sweeping up weekly, and now I'm getting curious. Every week I'm not getting dust. I'm getting granules.

Now, these granules have to come from somewhere, and they have to go somewhere. I suspect that they get into the water supply. So you might look into that.

Next thing is -- I wish the State would make up its mind on earthquakes. I'm paying three times what it costs for earthquake insurance in Northridge where the buildings were destroyed.

My earthquake insurance is three times that, and I'm on Van Gogh. So I think somebody thinks we're going to have an earthquake. We've had two, and they must think we're going to have three. So for goodness sakes, the liners should be, at least, three

times -- actually, if you could do it in seismic, it boils down to 900 times' thick. So, fellahs, next thing is you drain this stuff off into the sewer. What sewer? The sewer that goes into the ocean? Oh, good. Santa Monica will love you.

Fellahs, get a look into things like this, and by the way, we're talking about the solid earth. You know how far Metropolitan Water District had to go down for the building that they're building south of Balboa? Seventy feet to find solid earth, and then, they compacted it.

I'm at a loss. You go down to bedrock, and they had to compact it to build a one-story building? So I don't think that we know the geology of this earth. Oh, yeah. One more thing.

Van Gogh sits on top of two streams, one at 27 feet below ground level. The other is 54 feet, and that's about where they gave up. They stopped at 80 feet.

Now, we also know that Orozco sinks about every 10 years. So we have to assume that's an alluvial flow, and as they said about Bee Canyon, the water comes down, and it comes from that mountain when it rains hard enough.

Now we're safe for the next three years

because we're in El Nina, but what happens when we get an El Nino? They've got -- by the way, you realize we have a weapon of mass destruction. It's called "The Chlorinator" in the Metropolitan Water District.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Mrs. Mann, and after that, Mr. Gottesman, and our final speaker will be Mrs. Kolstad.

MRS. MANN: I don't have much more to say except there was a comment made about the Army Corps of Engineers and that, when you cut off where the water is, that you have to allow for it someplace else.

When you have a corridor where wild animals come to breed, to mate, to drink, birds, for their stopping way to their next point, you can't close up -- you cannot close a wetlands. They are going to close the wetlands and put it in Chatsworth.

You cannot take a wetlands -- you can't cut off the freeway at Balboa Boulevard and reopen it down by Magnolia. I mean, a bird needs a corridor in which to stop and drink and mate and do all of that.

That's the only thing that was not mentioned, and I haven't heard the decision of the Army Corps of Engineers, but they were not that interested in what we had to say, and BFI said there weren't any birds. There are a lot of birds. This is a corridor

for birds. I'm not that far from the dump. I counted about 12 different species of birds.

If you cut off a wetlands, you cut off wildlife. Wildlife creates a balance with human beings. We, actually, need to maintain whatever animals are left in the world -- we have to have a balance of life, and that's all I have to say about that. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you very much for your comments. Mr. Gottesman and, then, Mrs. Kolstad.

MR. GOTTESMAN: My name is Marc Gottesman. I've lived in Granada Hills all my life, and I'm thankful for this opportunity to speak to you who, I assume, are going to be --

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: I'm one of eight board members.

MR. GOTTESMAN: Eight board members. Well, thank you for the opportunity. One of the issues that I'm concerned about that I haven't heard mentioned -- I'm assuming that both you, Dennis and Susan, are familiar with the water treatment plant up here and the aqueduct that comes over the mountain, that these are open, that these are open to air.

One of the concerns I have is that when this was changed from a zoning of open space at this

end to heavy industrial at this end, we went through about five different layers of what an area can be zoned for.

I was at the zoning commission meeting, expressing my concern that, where I live in Granada Hills, I do not consider heavy industrial. What that means is that there will be diesel tractors running constantly. There will be an influx of many more diesel trash trucks coming to this location.

The amount of particulates in the area diesel engines which -- if you've ever been behind a truck or a trash truck, you realize that the amount of particulates coming out of these vehicles is quite a bit higher than a passenger car.

You have an open area water treatment plant in Van Norman Dam and, also, with the water that comes in from the area. We're talking about an increase in carcinogenic particulates from diesel engines that might be -- I'm just guessing -- we're talking about what it is now to what it may be when millions of tons are being brought into this dump.

Combine that with the fact that this area is a very high-wind area to the point where I just recently had a new roof put on my house, and there were all sorts of concerns about the pitch of the house and

what angle it is, what kind of roof can be put on it.

Why? Because it's considered a high-wind area when you deal with insurance companies, when you deal with the roofing companies. Wind has ripped off parts of my structure where I live in -- wind has gone, probably, up to 40 to 50 miles an hour.

What is going to happen when this dump gets to have 90 million tons or whatever it's going to be -- it doesn't need to be there at all when there's going to be wind blowing all the other things about the seismic area, and everything everyone says about earthquake faults -- after 46 years of living in Granada Hills, I'm considering moving my family away because I don't want to live in a heavy industrial zone, where there's going to be this kind of stuff in the air. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Mrs. Kolstad.

MS. KOLSTAD: Okay. Mine's kind of easy and simple. We will not --

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Could you just tell us your name, please.

MS. KOLSTAD: My name is Sally Kolstad, and I've lived in the Valley and I've lived in Granada Hills all my life. I had concern about the wind, too.

I, also, had concern about -- they say they

water down the dump with leachate. They water it down with that, and I think they also water it down with a deodorizer of some kind.

What happens when our Santa Ana winds come up and they blow from the north and all that comes out to all those homes on the other side of the mountain? Who is going to smell all that? Who is going to get cancer from all that? The school kids. I'm a P.E. teacher, and I don't want to be out there when the wind is blowing and all those kids are smelling all that crap.

The other thing is -- when I got married, I moved to Sylmar, and I moved right off Roxford and the 5 Freeway. I smelled the dump. I smelled it -- okay? -- three to six times a year, and it didn't smell good, and it lasted most of the day. Okay? I called -- I don't remember at the time who I called -- the dump, and they said they would look into it and investigate, and probably, by around dusk time, the smell was gone, but I smelled the dump, and I don't think that's fair.

And the other thing -- for those of us in the Valley that read the paper, they said the crows are dying by -- numerous amounts of deaths per year, and they don't know why. Okay? What's happening to our

wildlife?

And the other question I have is: If they increase the dump, it's going to increase the sea gulls, and are we going to let the sea gulls poop in our water?

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Okay. That concludes the public testimony portion of this. I want to thank all of you for coming to speak today and for coming to listen and to let you know that we take your comments very seriously, and we're going to have a five-minute break, and when we come back, Mr. Dickerson says he's going to need about 15 minutes to try to be responsive to some of the issues that you raised today, not for the purpose of argument, but for the purpose of just trying to clarify technical issues and trying to answer some of your questions.

There will be a second public hearing which starts at 6:00 P.M., where we will review the same information and take new public testimony from anybody who hasn't spoken today this afternoon.

THE AUDIENCE: If people want to submit written comments, what's the due date?

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Rod, what's the due date for written comments? Let me just explain that we do ask you to have written comments --

(Off-the-record discussion)

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: The due date for this is July 8th for your written comments. The purpose for that is it allows staff time to read them and answer them and get it to all the board members so that we can read them. We get binders for every board meeting, many more than two, and we try to read everything.

So we need a little time. So if you could get, if you need to -- you need to get your comments to us by July 8th in order for them -- written comments to be considered by the board. Any comments that you made today will be, of course, incorporated into the record that is given to the board. Thank you all, and we'll see you in five minutes.

(Short recess)

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

I'm going to turn the mic over to Mr. Dickerson, who was carefully writing down comments and questions and is going to try to make some technical and process clarifications for you.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay. Let me just explain, again, how our process works with regard to questions. All the questions that have been raised here will be responded to in great detail in a written document, and

that written document -- everyone here has signed up or, at least, indicated to us that you're here, and also, those of you who have spoken are indicated with blue cards. So that sheet that you signed in -- we will mail you a copy of the detailed responses.

So, please, make sure that we do have your address for that purpose. Now, what I'm going to do next is -- I've highlighted a few of the key questions. Mr. Rod Nelson is the chief of our landfill unit and will help me with responding to some of those questions. I'm not going to be able to address all of them right now, but it will touch on, really, the big issues that people have asked about.

The first question had to do with what if the experts are wrong, and I'd like to respond to that one. When it comes down to making technical decisions, sure, experts can be wrong. I think that's happened, you know, through time immemorial, and what we have with a landfill is a lot of backup measures to address that.

We talked at length about the liner system, talked at length about the clay, how difficult it is for the water to come through that clay, talked about the leachate system. The whole point of it is -- in a landfill designed now, they are really designed to have

minimal impact on the groundwater, and in terms of backup, you have monitoring wells which allow you to go in and do corrective action.

And so, yes, something could go wrong, conceivably, you know. An error could be made, or something could be done in the future that could cause an ostensive problem. The whole problem of corrective action is designed so you have the opportunity to go back in and fix the problem. It's identified, and that's what, really, the important element of a monitoring well is all about.

Some questions were raised about 91 violations. Rod, do you have a list? Or, at least, you understand not all of those 91 violations are water quality, and there's just a relatively few that relate to water quality. Could you go through that?

MR. NELSON: Yes. I'll go through quickly. We went through our records and checked to see what kind of violations the Regional Board had issued with regard to water quality issues, and on the City Side, we went back to 1982, and we came up with five. Back in '82, the landfill had up to 20 gallons of chemical petroleum and chemical waste. That was even before I started with the board.

They failed to submit some in 1988. There

was erosion and surface runoff observed on the cover in '91. There was ponding on the top of the City Side Landfill in '93 and some erosion as a result of that ponding, and in 1994, we had some violations.

We couldn't determine exactly what they are, and at the county site, we just showed three in 1996, and that was when I noticed when I was out there, because of the direction of grading and the operational landfill, runoff was collecting near the waste, and they had to correct that and regrade out.

In 2001, there was ponding of storm water on the innervating cover, and later in 2001, some VOCs were detected in the subdrain water as discussed during the presentation beneath the county site.

MR. DICKERSON: Rod, do you have a remedy, or were they addressed --

MR. NELSON: They were addressed according to the violation, whether it was regrading prepared cover material -- in the case of the VOCs, we meet the subdrain -- the operative BFI had to submit a work plan as to how they were going to remedy that, and the staff reviewed and, ultimately, approved their proposal.

MR. DICKERSON: Would you consider any of those violations to be very significant violations?

MR. NELSON: Well, obviously, landfill

impacts should not be detected beneath the landfill. So the nature of that is a significant violation. If you have some erosion, that's easily remedied. If you have landfill impacts beneath the landfill, you have, perhaps, a lot more work cut out for you.

MR. DICKERSON: In our responsive comments, we'll have much more detail on that particular concern.

MR. NELSON: Yes, we will. And BFI as VOC detection beneath the --

MR. DICKERSON: A question was raised regarding the cumulative impact of the whole site, that we're really not talking about just one landfill. There were really multiple landfills, and I have assessed that the way that's addressed is through the various monitoring wells, the controls that are integral to the various systems. Can you expand on that a little?

MR. NELSON: Well, typically, landfills start out in one place, and then, they grow bigger, and when they initially start out, there's a monitoring system to cover that specific area.

As a unit expands, the monitoring systems are modified. In most cases, the monitoring wells themselves have to be moved because they are going to be covered up with waste and move out to the next

perimeter of the waste, and controls evolve in that manner to reflect the expansion of a facility.

MR. DICKERSON: So, really, in considering this particular proposal, it's not just totally independent from the other sites.

MR. NELSON: No. If there were to be any expansion beyond that which is proposed now, the monitoring and contaminant pieces would have to expand to reflect that.

MR. DICKERSON: There was a question raised about putting on our Web site information about water quality test and any violations. I think that sounds like a very good suggestion, and that's something I'll ask our staff to follow up on.

There was a question about what happens when the various permits conflict. Which one would be more stringent? Which one would prevail? Who would enforce that?

Rod, I have assessed whichever -- whichever agency has a violation that occurs within its own purview or its own permit would generally be the agency that would enforce; is that correct?

MR. NELSON: That is correct. And in the case of daily cover that, I believe, was mentioned -- we include that in our permits, just as a matter of

fact. That's something that's included in the operational landfill. We do not have direct regulatory authority over daily cover, other than it has to be there so it won't impact, won't allow the liquids to get into the waste, but as far as the type of material that is used for daily cover, we defer to the Waste Board or the local enforcement agency or any other regulatory agency, such as the city or county, who may have more restrictive requirements for that type of operation.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay. A concern was raised about salt monitoring, and let me just explain the salt monitoring that goes on with all of the permits that we have. We require expertise to do a lot of monitoring at the various sites, and this applies not only to landfills. It applies to sewage treatment plants. It applies to any discharge that is regulated by the Regional Board.

If the Regional Board were to assume the cost of all of that monitoring that's required, it would really be a very substantial amount, and that would be, obviously, state -- so what we have, generally, is a program of taking in the monitoring data, and that data is required to be tested and certified and various certifications that have to be

made on the documents, given to the Regional Board to certify that it's a trustworthy document, and that's how the system generally works.

And on top of that, the Regional Board does have a very limited availability to go out and do what you might call check sampling, and so we do do that from time to time.

Another question had to do with earthquakes. There are, actually, several questions that dealt with earthquakes. Let me just paraphrase several of those. What is the susceptibility of a proposed landfill to thrust faults? Are those thrust faults something that's a very serious concern? How can the integrity of the liner be assured during an earthquake?

And there's another one here. Can the new liner design withstand an earthquake? And in the document, there's a review that has to take place in the application materials as I commented on by the Department of Water Resources.

MR. NELSON: They were another independent market.

MR. DICKERSON: What would be the extent of that review, in terms of confirming the kinds of questions that were asked?

MR. NELSON: I think there's kind of two parts to this. You've utilized the Department of Water Resources in the past because they are very knowledgeable on safety, and they have to consider the impacts of earthquakes on dams, which would be the more immediate threat of health and safety, if the dam broke and if something -- and they are very knowledgeable, and we've really appreciated their help in the past.

We have a very good working relationship with them, and they regulate -- the community on the whole has pretty much accepted them as a neutral third-party reviewer and whatever WDR has done in the past with very few altercations has been the end of the story. When they made a determination, that's the way it's been.

As far as earthquake impacts to the site are concerned, a couple of things here. One, we have required Sunshine Canyon and any other active Class III landfills -- all of our Class III landfills in our region, including Sunshine Canyon, are required to be designed as a hazardous waste landfill. We have very thorough and detailed regulations for our involvement in landfill -- construction and closure, and we do have some impact in deciding that if a facility gets a permit from the landowner to operate a landfill in a

particular location, there are certain restrictions that even if the land use -- put a landfill here. It cannot be located -- and this is more of a Waste Board issue here -- within 5,000 feet or 10,000 feet above a jet airport. It cannot be located in a 100-year floodplain. It cannot be located on an unseen fault, which is a -- landfills have to be set back 200 feet. Individual homes only have to be set back 50 feet from an earthquake fault.

As I said, the intensity of the earthquake -- we are requiring these people to design to an equivalent of a hazardous waste landfill. There is a less stringent requirement for State regulations that is used by many other regions in other areas for landfill design.

The Regional Board staff here in Los Angeles -- I think we're the only region that requires a geologic map be made of any final excavation grade. Staff then goes out and reviews the map out in the field. We look at the map.

We look at the actual excavation to make sure there's not any active earthquake-faulting evidence in the excavation, and this is the best time to look at it, when we removed all the loose soil, and we got down to clean undisturbed material. There's

discussion about thrust faulting. You bet you.

Santa Susana Mountains in there -- those things are lifting from the ground. There's a term called, "blind thrust fault," and they have been projected up into this area. The map that the lady spoke of prior, earlier in the evening or in the afternoon -- it was shown there were numerous faults in the area. We're very aware of those. That's why we require a geologic map to be made of this specific area.

Those smaller scale maps which cover larger areas are just by the nature of their design sort of a gross representation. It can't be that accurate. That's why we require that we look specifically at the area.

MR. DICKERSON: So because we do have earthquakes in this area, we take a higher level of concern and care with regard to our design concerns and operational concerns about a landfill to reflect that additional --

MR. NELSON: Very concerned and very careful about this.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay. And finally, there was a question about -- let's assume it's 30 years after the landfill has closed, and problems arise. How

would they be corrected? And I know that there's a post-closure process. There's various measures that have to be taken in order to assure that closure-response capability still exists, if you could summarize that.

MR. NELSON: Well, there are two funds that have to be set aside by the landfill operator that cannot be used for anything other than, specifically, specified in the regulation. One of them is -- because once a landfill closes, there's no more money being generated. So you have to set aside the money while you're operating and you're making money to deal with any problems that might arise.

Now, the regulations say in the case of these Class III landfills, the operator is responsible for a minimum of 30 years after they close or as long as it represents a threat to water quality.

So you can have 30 years of groundwater and surface-water monitoring after the landfill closed to base any sort of decision on.

There's a second fund that's required for any -- in this case, rather nebulous, but -- any reasonably foreseeable release.

So you have money set aside, based on the construction, the location, and the history, that this

type of leak might occur if. You have to have money set aside, specifically, for that. The post-closure maintenance funding for 30 years is just for normal maintenance of the operations, the groundwater monitoring, and ensuring that the landfill is maintained in a manner that there's not any erosion, that there's not any slumping, and people aren't going in there and, perhaps, illegal-dumping.

MR. DICKERSON: When we get to the written responses, let's make sure we add quite a bit of definition to that.

MR. NELSON: We can, probably, put people to sleep with some of this stuff.

MR. DICKERSON: There are other questions, but we're going to address those in written materials, and again, please, make sure we have your address so we can mail you that response, and at this point, I'll turn it back over to our board chair, Susan Cloke.

Rod, one more thing.

MR. NELSON: I'd just like to request that people -- if you can be as specific as possible. We try to write down everyone's concerns raised today, but we would love to see A, B, C, D, E, F, G.

MR. DICKERSON: Letters.

MR. NELSON: Letters. And we'll respond A,

B, C, D, E, F, G. I believe we misspoke a little bit earlier, and that is staff's fault, not yours, because you were reading some of the stuff we put down there.

We erroneously said leachate was used for dusting purposes. We use -- leachate itself going into the sewer. What we haven't been using -- subdrain water, and by the time it's taken up, there's nothing left in it. So it's, essentially, just stream water that is reused for dusting over the system.

MR. DICKERSON: Thank you for that clarification.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you everyone.

This concludes our afternoon public hearing on the proposal for the landfill. Thank you all for your participation.

(Dinner recess from 5:30 P.M. to 6:07 P.M.)

EVENING SESSION

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for coming tonight to be part of the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board Community Meeting on the Proposed Sunshine Canyon Landfill.

This is the second meeting we've had like

this today. There were about 75 people at this afternoon's meeting, and I think we had a good opportunity to hear from the public, and I hope that the public who was here will agree that they had not only a good opportunity to be heard but, also, a good opportunity to learn some more about how the Regional Board functions and what our scope of authority and responsibility is.

The Regional Board is a water quality board. We do not have authority or jurisdiction on land use or zoning matters. Those decisions about the appropriate land use and the appropriate zoning were made by the Los Angeles City Council under their authority and jurisdiction.

We do have authority to protect groundwater, and we have authority to control storm water runoff and other matters related to water quality and to the beneficial uses of the water, all of which will be explained in great detail by Mr. Dennis Dickerson, who is sitting to my right up here, who is our executive officer for the Regional Water Quality Control Board.

I'm Susan Cloke. I'm chair of the board, and for those of you who will be joining us, again, on our July 24th Board Meeting, where we discuss and

potentially vote on this project, you will see me again, as well as my seven other board colleagues.

We are all members of the Water Board appointed by the governor. I want to go through the format for tonight's meeting and let you know that first we're going to have an explanation of the regulatory process and the recommendations that are being made by staff concerning the tentative order for the proposed landfill.

After Mr. Dickerson is through, I will call people based on these blue cards. So if you want to speak, please, fill out one of these blue cards.

Mr. Caine, will you raise your hand? Mr. Caine will help you get a card, if you need help, and he will also be happy to bring them up to me and, also, to answer any questions about how to get on the speakers' list or the mailing list or things like that.

While you are speaking, Mr. Dickerson and other staff will be making notes regarding your comments, and at the end of the public comment period, I will ask Mr. Dickerson to respond to the comments that you have made to answer the technical questions, the process questions, and so on, in the hope that we can have a useful exchange of information about the responsibilities of the Regional Board and the factual

issues, as well as allowing us the opportunity to better understand what your concerns are.

At this moment, I only have two speaker cards; is that correct? Dr. Wayne Aller and Mr. David Edwards. Oh, three. I feel like an auctioneer. Going, gone. More. Okay.

So before we begin, I would like to recognize Mr. Greig as Council Member Elect Greig Smith.

Greig, do you want to stand up and let everybody get a good look at you? They, probably, all know you already; right? And thank you for joining our discussion, and I see that our commissioner is still with us. Thank you for staying with us in the evening.

Having said that, the only other thing I need to say is -- we're hoping you're going to be able to say everything that's important to you in a three-minute time period. For those of you who were here this afternoon, I let a couple of people who had a lot of factual information and so on go over that because we do want to hear what you have to say, but without curtailing your comments, anything you could do to stay within the three-minute time period would be appreciated.

Having said that, of course, we want to

know what you have to say. I, also, wanted to say that if somebody else has made comments that you agree with, you don't need to argue them a second time. You can let us know that you agreed with the comments of a previous speaker, and we will give that the same weight as if you had argued them.

So before I turn the mic over to Mr. Dickerson, although this meeting is being held in the community because we wanted to make it possible for everybody to participate without having to come downtown Los Angeles and speak at a formal board meeting, this is, nevertheless, a meeting of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and we do begin our meetings with a pledge, and so I would ask you to join us, and maybe Mr. Smith would like to lead us.

(Pledge of allegiance)

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you very much, Council Member Elect.

And for anybody who is going to be testifying, staff and public, we also take an oath. So if anyone -- Mr. Feldman, Mr. Bondall, Dr. Aller, Mr. Edwards, if you could all rise, and anyone else who thinks that they might be moved to speak tonight, now is the best time to do this. Okay?

Put your hands up.

///

Audience participants of the Los Angeles Water Board Meeting, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you very much.

Mr. Dickerson.

MR. DICKERSON: Thank you, Chairwoman Cloke, and thank you, everyone, for coming this evening. It's a pleasure to see you here.

This evening, the presentation that I have is, roughly, 20 to 25 minutes long, and it's going to give you an overview of the proposed permit that the Regional Board staff has been working on, and at some point, I may lapse into a little bit of technical jargon. Let me apologize for that in advance. I'm going to try to use as little of that as possible and to certainly expand on any thoughts I have.

Why don't we go to the first slide. I'm going to briefly prepare and discuss the proposed Sunshine Canyon Landfill Expansion and the Tentative Waste Discharge Requirements, and the Regional Board staff refers to these as WERs, and for convenience this evening, I'm not going to use that term. I'm going to refer to the permits. A WDR is the same thing as a

permit, and this is a currently proposed permit.

For those of you who are not familiar with the term "tentative," one of the handouts that you picked up is the draft permit, and in its draft, you'll see the words "tentative" in big letters down the side.

That's a document that is a draft. It is pending for consideration by the Regional Board and would be considered by the board at their public hearing on the 24th of July. It's a document -- since it's tentative, it can be changed. It can be changed by staff, based upon comments that are provided to us.

We look at comments, and we assess the comments, and we can make changes prior to it going to the board for consideration. That's often done to reflect the technical corrections that we find are necessary, and it certainly can be modified by the Regional Board itself at a public hearing.

Following my presentation, we'll be interested in getting your thoughts on the proposed expansion and the Tentative Permit.

(Off-the-record discussion)

MR. DICKERSON: Let me just clarify that it can be modified. The Tentative Permit at the board hearing can be modified. It can be held over. It can be rejected by the board. There's a number of

different things that can happen to a permit at a board or proposed permit at a board hearing, and I'll cover those, again, a little bit later on, I think, at the last slide.

The slide that you have here is a photograph of the Sunshine Canyon Landfill, and to the upper left, you will see the county portion of that, which is currently operating. Below that, to the right, you will see the old City Side Landfill that is now closed, and you see the Interstate 5 to the right, the 14 Freeway, and our location would be off the photograph and down in the direction of that squiggly line there.

Next slide: Sunshine Canyon Landfill includes two separate Class III municipal solid waste management units. They are referred to more specifically as the Sunshine Canyon City Side Landfill and, as you can see on the right, the Sunshine County Extension Landfill on the left.

Under current regulations, Class III landfills are those landfills that receive only nonhazardous municipal solid waste. This is the regular trash that is picked up from your homes. That's the kind of waste that can go to this landfill, and that's at county, and of course, that's proposed as

well.

The City Side Landfill and the County Extension Landfill are owned and operated by Browning Ferris Industries of California. This is a photograph showing the City Side Landfill. It's a recent photograph, and this particular landfill began accepting solid waste in 1958. It ceased operations in September of 1991.

The final cover of the City Side Landfill consists of a soil cover with a minimum thickness of six feet. As is the case with most Class III landfills operating at that time, the City Side Landfill was not equipped with any of the protective measures required today to contain and remove contaminants from the landfill, which is to say that garbage is placed directly on the ground and, then, covered.

The next photograph shows you the County Extension Landfill, which is currently open and receiving waste. The County Extension Landfill began operation in 1996, and it will reach its capacity in about three to four years. It currently receives an average of 6,000 tons of municipal solid waste per day.

Unlike the City Side Landfill, the County Extension Landfill has been constructed to meet Federal and State standards for Class III landfills and is

equipped with a composite liner and a leachate collection and removal system.

Now, it's important to note, in this particular slide, you see the trash being placed, and behind that you'll see a slope, and where that line is being drawn by the laser, you see the liner that's located there, and I'll be talking a bit more in detail -- there's other covers that we're showing you about the liner and how that works.

Landfills in California are mainly regulated by the California Integrated Waste Management Board and the State Water Resources Control Board through its agent Regional Board. The Waste Board and its local enforcement agencies, in this case, the city of Los Angeles and the county of Los Angeles, are responsible for regulating the daily operations of landfills, such as waste disposal activities, traffic control, uses control, and the like.

The Regional Board is responsible for regulating construction of liners, leachate collection and removal systems, water quality monitoring, and the requirements for the final closure of the landfill.

There are a number of permits that apply to the Sunshine Canyon Landfill, and the slide shows you four of those. I'm going to walk you through each of

those, in turn. The first is the permit for the inactive City Side Landfill, which was adopted by the Regional Board in November of 1987, and it covers landfill operations at the site.

This permit needs to be revised, upgraded, updated to reflect the current status of the landfill and impose and update its requirements related to post-closure maintenance.

The next permit is the current Regional Board Permit for the County Extension Landfill, which was adopted in July of 1991, and that's for the operation of a Class III Landfill.

Besides the specific permit, the County Extension Landfill is, also, regulated by another board order adopted in 1993, and it's referred to as the Super Order. The Super Order contains Federal Solid Waste Disposal regulations, and it's applicable to all Class III landfills that are active since October of 1991.

Now, the Super Order was not applicable to the City Side Landfill because it stopped accepting waste before the Federal deadline. However, if the proposed extension is approved, all the Federal regulations with the Super Order will be applicable to the City Landfill expansion.

The next permit relates to storm water, and the entire Sunshine Canyon Landfill is, also, regulated by a general Storm Water Permit for industrial activities for the discharge of storm water at the site. You see the determiner is NPDES. That's the term that relates to the Federal law. It's National Permit Discharge Elimination System -- is what that means. It goes back to 1972.

The Storm Water Permit requires BFI to implement best management practices, also, known as BMTs, to protect storm water discharges at the site from being contaminated by landfill operations. In addition, for any major construction project, such as the development of a landfill cell five acres or larger, BFI is also regulated by the general Storm Water Permit that is, specifically, issued for construction. There's two separate permits, one for construction, one for general operation.

The proposed landfill expansion is covered next. The current landfill will reach its design capacity by approximately 2007. BFI has proposed a landfill expansion that will join the two existing landfills together.

However, because the two local enforcement agencies, namely, the city and county of Los Angeles,

were not able to review the application jointly, BFI decided to first apply for a landfill expansion only within the city of Los Angeles.

Now, the next slide lays out that expansion. It displays the footprint of the proposed landfill expansion, and this new landfill unit, if approved, would be developed over an area of, approximately, 84 acres with a net capacity of about 7.5 million tons of municipal solid waste. The operational life of this phase of the landfill expansion would be, approximately, 4.8 years, if approved.

BFI refers to the first expansion as the Phase I of the City Landfill expansion, and it has indicated that it will apply for a Phase II expansion later. Phase II is expected to occupy the rest of the area within the blue dashed line that is proposed.

So you see here the brown area is the proposed landfill expansion that's being considered by the board currently. The blue dotted line reflects the Phase II, which is not currently before the board.

The next slide shows you the County Extension Landfill and the areas for the proposed City Side Landfill expansion. And you can see the active landfill in the background being shown to you there,

and then, the landfill expansion area you can see and get a sense of where that is, and in the foreground, would be the existing landfill.

In order for the Regional Board to adopt the permit to regulate the operation for the proposed landfill, the city of Los Angeles must first approve the landfill expansion in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act or CEQA.

The CEQA document, also, called the final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report or SEIR, was certified by the city of Los Angeles in October of 1999. In December of 1999, the Los Angeles City Council passed an ordinance that changed the zoning where the City Landfill is located from agriculture to heavy industrial to accommodate the landfill expansion.

It's important to note that that was a predicate, and in fact, it had to be for this to come to the board at this time. The proposed city's landfill expansion and the final closure of the existing City Side Landfill will result in the removal of more than five acres of wetlands at the site.

Pursuant to the Federal Clean Water Act, BFI must compensate for the loss of wetlands. A 404 permit refers to a section in the Clean Water Act, Federal Clean Water Act, and it must be issued by the

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the 401 Certificate, which is issued by the Regional Board -- 401, again, refers to the provision of the Federal Clean Water Act. It is issued by the Regional Board before construction can be started. The 401 Certificate application is processed by the board staff separately from the permit.

To obtain a permit from the Regional Board, BFI must submit what's called a Joint Technical Document or JTD. I'm not going to call it that too much. It's equivalent to a permit application that contains information concerning this case, the proposed expansion of the City Side Sunshine Canyon Landfill.

It is called a Joint Technical Document because it is, also, submitted to other regulatory agencies, such as the Integrated Waste Management Board, to apply for other permits, and for the rest of this discussion, I'm going to refer to it as the "Consolidated Permit Application." It seems to make more sense.

BFI submitted the Consolidated Permit Application for the proposed landfill expansion to the Regional Board in February of 2002. So since that time, Regional Board staff has been reviewing it, have provided comments, have received responses from BFI,

and then, determined that the application is complete for the purpose of developing a tentative proposed permit.

The Consolidated Permit Application is available review at the Granada Hills Public Library, and we also brought along a copy of it here today, if anyone needs to refer to it. That is what it looks like on the table.

Now, the Tentative Permit has some aspects to it I'd like to go over. It incorporates a number of provisions, including a Tentative Monitoring Reporting Program. These documents have been sent out for public comment, and we've been working closely with the North Valley Coalition to ensure that they had copies of that and have been coordinating to set up this meeting as well, and we thank them for their assistance.

Copies of the document can be obtained from our Web site. They can also be reviewed at the library, and we have them here today for you as well. As I noted earlier, the Tentative will be heard at a Board Meeting on July 24th at the Metropolitan Water District downtown, 700 Alameda Street. The next few slides will explain the essential components of the Tentative Permit.

Now, it's important to note certain kinds

of waste that can and cannot be discharged or placed into the landfill. The Tentative Permit limits the acceptable materials of that proposed landfill expansion and limits them to nonhazardous solid waste and inert solid waste only.

Nonhazardous waste is regular waste such as garbage, trash, refuse, paper, rubbish, ashes, and the like. Inert wastes are uncontaminated soil, rock, concrete, bricks, and that sort of thing.

It's important to note what cannot be accepted at the landfill. It cannot receive hazardous waste, designated waste, special waste, such as foundry sand, or any waste that is not suitable to be discharged as a Class III Landfill, such as sewage sludge.

With regard to landfill operations, the tenant permit includes extensive requirements. Most important of these are requirements to keep an operating record, proper maintenance of the landfill, implementation of the waste load checking program, using appropriate daily cover, leachate collection removal, and reporting to the Regional Board any noncompliance of the permit.

The proposed landfill expansion will also be constructed and operated in conformance with the

applicable Federal and State standards and will be equipped with a composite liner system, if approved. In some portions, liners will be constructed over the side slopes of the existing City Side Landfill.

The final design and construction plans must be reviewed and approved by the Regional Board staff prior to installation. The seismic stability designs for the landfill that are submitted to the Regional Board are also reviewed by experts in the California Department of Water Resources.

Next I'm going to show you a slide here that illustrates a cross section of the base liner system. There's actually two different liners.

This is the first that I'll talk about, and it includes from bottom to top a prepared base of bedrock, a compacted clay layer, a synthetic liner, which is the blue line -- you see that -- the leachate drainage layer, and an operations layer.

While it's important to note that bedrock at Sunshine Canyon is relatively impermeable, it means that groundwater does not flow easily through it, and that will provide additional protection to the groundwater beneath the landfill.

The compacted clay liner portion that you see is, at least, two feet thick and composed of very

low permeable clay material. It's very difficult for water to move through that clay material. The synthetic liner itself is made of high density polyethylene plastic, which is commonly used at landfills across the country.

The leachate collection system is made of coarse gravel and pipelines and is designed to move any liquid that collects at the bottom of the landfill, and those two black circles there reflect pipes that, actually, are going through the entire landfill to collect leachate.

Let me talk a little bit about what leachate is. Every landfill is going to generate leachate. As you put into your trash any number of materials which either are liquid, semi-liquid food waste, whatever it is, it's going to over time degrade and decompose, and it generates liquids, and those liquids are considered to be leachate. So we're talking about a collection of all that liquid which is, basically, compressed in the landfill when it's compacted. It leaches out and, then, finds its way to that collection system.

The operations layer, top layer there, is a layer of clean soil, at least, two feet thick that is used to protect the liner system from being damaged by,

let's say, bulldozers or other equipment that has to go over that.

The next slide shows you a double-liner system which is used in a very sensitive area of the landfill which is designed for collecting the leachate and pulling it out of the system, and it's much more -- I don't want to use the term effective, but it's much more protective of groundwater because it's at a low point in the landfill, where you're trying to get the leachate that's been generated to collect so you can pump it out.

So the slide illustrates a double-liner system used to construct leachate sumps at the landfill. A sump is part of the liner system about the size of a home swimming pool, where leachate sumps are installed, and that pumps out that leachate that's collected from a low point from the landfill.

Because it's located at the lowest point, it is the most critical part of the liner system. So what you see there in the middle -- what's different about this is you have two individual synthetic liners, and they are separated by a clay liner, and this gives you added assurance that the leachate that's being collected above the blue line, the first blue line, will not transit itself through those extra layers and

down into the compacted clay and, ultimately, to find its way to groundwater.

The next slide is a photograph which shows you more clearly what that operations layer looks like, the leachate collection layer down at the bottom. Remember that slide early on where you saw a photograph of the liner. That's near the top.

So what you're seeing here is, really, the bottom of the landfill itself, what it looks like before any waste comes into it at all.

With regard to monitoring, BFI would be required to monitor groundwater at 10 groundwater monitoring wells and one groundwater extraction trench. Water samples will be regularly analyzed for a full range of pollutants that may be expected at the landfill.

Besides groundwater monitoring, BFI will also be required to monitor leachate surface water, subdrain water, and landfill gas at the site.

The next slide shows you the groundwater monitoring network at Sunshine Canyon Landfill. The red dots represent groundwater monitoring wells, and I would like you to take a note that "MW-10" stands for "Monitoring Well No. 10." It is located at this point, and I'll be talking about that in a bit more detail

shortly.

There's a groundwater extraction trench which is shown there. It was constructed across the canyon bottom to intercept groundwater flow. What you have to visualize here is that, before there was a landfill, this was a canyon where the water would be flowing down from, basically, the northwest towards the southeast in that direction, and the idea of the trench is really to collect that water as it's, maybe, coming down to ensure it's intercepted, and that water that's collected at the trench is used for irrigation and dust control.

Now, there are some known groundwater concerns that we have about the site, and I'd like to walk you through that. They include the detection of low-level volatile organic compounds or VOCs at one of the down-gradient groundwater monitoring wells at the City Side Landfill and the subdrain water at the County Extension Landfill, and high concentrations of dissolved solids, what we call TDS, including chloride, sulfate, and some other inorganic constituents in the groundwater at the site.

By referring to chlorides and sulfates, we're really talking about salts that are in the water. Now, volatile organic carbon compounds are a group of

organic compounds that are commonly detected in the landfill leachate and landfill gas but do not normally exist in uncontaminated groundwater.

Because of that, the presence of that is a good indicator that there may be some contamination. On the other hand, total dissolved solids are always detected in groundwater in varying amounts. They naturally occur, and so, depending upon what you normally have in an area, it may be very difficult to use that as an indicator of a landfill release.

I'm going to talk now specifically about volatile organic carbon compounds at the City Side Landfill. Remember, this is the unlined portion of the landfill.

Monitoring Well 10, if you'll recall where that was -- and we pointed that out two slides ago -- is a shallow groundwater monitoring well at the toe of the unlined City Side Landfill, and it's approximately -- this well is, approximately, 180 feet from the footprint of the landfill. The well was installed in 1993, and since 1994, low levels of several carbon compounds have been detected at the well.

Subsequent investigation concluded that the volatile organic carbon compounds were the result of

landfill gas impacts to groundwater.

In response, BFI repaired and upgraded the gas collection system at the direction of the Regional Board in 1997. Since that time, both the frequency and magnitude of volatile organic compound detections in the well have been significantly reduced, and that's due to corrective actions that have been taken.

Since January 2000, only one volatile organic compound was detected, and its concentrations have been consistently less than what's called the maximum contaminant level for drinking water. So that's a very low concentration, and it's below the level that would be a concern for drinking water.

No volatile organic compounds have been detected and confirmed at any other groundwater well on site.

Now I'll turn to the Active County Extension Landfill, and remember, it is constructed and equipped with a composite liner system. Beneath the liner, a subdrain system has been installed to collect shallow seepage and spring waters that were encountered during the construction of the landfill.

The water collected in the subdrain system is discharged through several pipeline outlets to a sediment basin subbase that drains off-site. In early

2001, high concentrations of methane and hydrogen sulfite were detected at the subdrain outlets.

Subsequent analysis detected VOCs or volatile organic carbon compounds in the water discharged from the subdrain outlets. The concentrations of VOCs are all lower than drinking water maximum contaminant levels.

The volatile organic carbon compounds in the subdrain water is, also, believed to be caused by landfill gas. Now, at the direction of Regional Board staff, BFI has been diverting the subdrain water and, then, reusing it for dust control at the landfill since May of 2001.

In the interim, BFI has taken actions to remove gas from the subdrain system which has significantly reduced concentrations of the gases at the subdrain outlets as well as the volatile organic carbon compounds in the subdrain water.

Now I'll turn to high levels of total dissolved solids in the groundwater. Remember that these are inorganic constituents. They are not organic compounds, and they are things like chloride, sulfate, sodium, and calcium, things which we normally consider to be salts, and these have been found in groundwater samples from Sunshine Canyon, especially in the

down-gradient wells.

For example, the total dissolved solid concentrations in groundwater from the Sunshine Canyon, especially at the down-gradient wells -- for example, the total dissolved solid concentrations in the groundwater from the Sunshine Canyon range from 1,000 to 4,000 milligrams per liter, and the maximum contamination level of drinking water for taste is 500 milligrams per liter. So it gives you a sense of where that is.

Now, we believe that as Regional Board staff that the high levels of inorganic constituents are not necessarily or likely caused by a landfill for several specific reasons.

First, the natural rocks in this area are marine sediments, and it's very common for marine sediments to be associated with high levels of total dissolved solids in groundwater that they are associated with.

Volatile organic carbon compounds, the most direct evidence of landfill impact, have not been detected, with the exception of that one well, Monitoring Well 10.

Finally, stable isotope analysis showed no relationship between the groundwater and landfill

leachate. So there's some fairly strong evidence that we believe supports that.

At the same time, we cannot completely exclude the possibility that some inorganic constituents may have been released from the landfill to the groundwater. However, because the groundwater area is naturally high in salts, the relatively high salt concentrations down-gradient from the landfill do not significantly impact the beneficial uses of the groundwater.

You may have heard about some radioactivity testing that was done at landfills, not only this landfill, but several others in the area, and I'm going to touch on that briefly.

There have been concerns regarding the issue of radioactive waste being accepted by Class III landfills, and as a result of direction by the State Monitoring Water Resources Control Board, various studies were done over the past few months to identify and collect samples and analyze them for radioactive constituents.

Currently, neither the County Extension Landfill nor the City Side Landfill were ever permitted to receive radioactive waste, and there's no specific evidence indicating that any radioactive waste was

knowingly accepted at the landfill.

BFI implements a load-checking program at the site to screen and reject any unacceptable wastes, including radioactive substances. Even so, small objects that contain low levels of radioactive materials, such as exit signs, gold watches, fire extinguishers, and such are, possibly, getting into the landfill. These small objects are not expected to cause significant environmental problems at the landfill with regard to radioactivity.

The groundwater sampling investigation that included the Sunshine Canyon Landfill has been organized by the City board and Regional Board, and the analytical data that we collected indicated that the concentration of tested radioactive species of groundwater at the site are all lower than drinking water maximum contamination levels, and that differs from the leachate which does have somewhat higher levels, but it's not in the groundwater, and it is being addressed.

With regard to required corrective action, BFI is required to continue upgrading, adjusting the landfill gas collection system at the site to eliminate the impact of the landfill gas to groundwater.

To minimize the potential for off-site

migration of contaminants through the shallow groundwater zone, BFI would be required to upgrade the existing groundwater extraction trench at the site that can construct a cutoff wall at the mouth of the canyon.

The cutoff wall would be located down-gradient of that Monitoring Well No. 10 and the area where volatile organic carbon compounds have been detected and up-gradient of the landfill's property boundary.

The cutoff wall will be key to the bedrock and completely cut off the shallow groundwater flow from the canyon. Because of the low permeability of bedrock at the site, the possibility of pollutants being released to the water resources outside the canyon is extremely low, once the shallow groundwater flow is cut off.

It's really important to exercise additional corrective action that may be required at any time by the Regional Board for any violation or any oversight that the Regional Board may need to correct.

So I reach my final slide, and I'll talk a little bit about the conclusions. Regional Board staff believes the Tentative Permit is going to protect the water resources of the state.

The Regional Board staff are very

interested in receiving your comments both today and in writing, if at all possible, and we will be developing responses to that and may modify the Proposed Tentative prior to the time it goes to the Regional Board.

At the public hearing, which is scheduled for July 24th, the Regional Board will consider all comments and testimony and decide whether to adopt, adopt with revision, continue consideration of the Tentative Permit to a future meeting, or not to adopt the permit.

At this time, if we can have the lights back on, I would like to acknowledge the staff who have worked on this project very hard and introduce them to you. First, Paula Rasmussen, who is the chief of our landfill and enforcement unit -- I should say section. Rod Nelson, who is chief of the landfill group, and Wayne Yang, who is the technical leader for the landfill project. So with that, I'll turn it back over to Chairwoman Cloke.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you, Mr. Dickerson.

Okay. So now we're onto the public testimony portion of our meeting, and the first speaker is Mr. Feldman.

Would you like to come up here and be at

@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@bbl••••••••••@@@@@@@@@@b@èÐÊ@àÞÈÒêÚX@æÒä~@@,ÌèÊä@šä\@ŒÊØÈÚÂÜ@îÒ
ØØ@ÄÊ••••@@@@@@@@@@d@šä\@„ÞÜÈÂØØ\••••@@@@@@@@@@f@@@@@@@@@@@@š¤\@ŒŠ˜ˆš,œt@@¨ÐÂÜÖ
@òÞê@ÌÞä@èÐÊ@Þàà Þäèê ÜÒèò••••@@@@@@@@@h@èÞ@æàÊÂÖ@èÐÒæ@ÂÌèÊäÜÞÞÜX@šæ\@†ÐÂÒäÚÂÜ@ÂÜ
È@ÚÊÚÄÊäæ@ÞÌ••••@@@@@@@@@@j@èÐÊ@æèÂÌÌ\@@¨ÐÂÜÖ@òÞê@ÌÞä@ÒÜèäÞÈêÆÒÜÎ@êæ@èÞ@òÞêä@æèÂ

ÌÌ\••••@@@@@@@@@@l@@@@@@@@@@@@@’æ@èÐÊ@æèÂÌÌ@ÚÊÚÄÊä@èÐÂè@àäÊàÂäÊÈ@èÐÊ••••@@@@@@@@
@@n@†ÂØÒÌÞäÜÒÂ@àäÊæÊÜèÃèÒÞÜ@ÐÊäÊX@èÞÞ~••••@@@@@@@@@@p@@@@@@@@@@@@@@š¤\@ˆ’†–
Š¤¦ œt@@’è@îÂæ@Â@ÔÞÒÜè@ÊÌÌÞäèX@ÂÜÈ•••

9 we're all here.

10 MR. FELDMAN: Okay. Excellent information

11 provided by BFI, and I think that presentation gave us

12 a good feel of what they had been telling us right

13 along, and it doesn't quite point to the problem.

14 We are expecting that when the Regional

15 Water Commission is looking at the problem of the

16 landfill, they're looking at it from the point of what

17 it does to affect the water supply, and so far we

18 haven't heard any of that.

19 Now, we understand what BFI is required to

20 do, as far as putting together the protections inside

21 the landfill, but there are things that they just don't

22 consider. One of them is just a perspective of this.

23 You started out the meeting saying that

24 your commission has no responsibility for land use, but

25 all we've heard so far was land use. What we'd like to

see -- and to put this in perspective, the picture on the far wall over there is an excellent picture of the landfill, but you know, if you just lift it back a little bit from that perspective, you would have seen the ticking time bomb because you would have seen across the street from that the biggest water supply in Los Angeles, and that, folks, is really what gives us cause for concern.

I think we can talk all we want about the landfill itself, but it's things outside of what BFI can do that is going to affect that. Number one is just going to be time. There's, probably, some good protections in there, but by the time that landfill begins to affect the water supply, everybody in this room is probably going to be a lot older, if we're even here, but we're leaving a legacy that the citizens of this community are going to have to deal with, and luckily, nobody here will be responsible at that time.

We left out the impact of earthquakes. We've been through a couple of earthquakes, and you can't tell me that the protections that BFI is building into this landfill can survive earthquakes because you can't test for that.

These are some of the concerns -- and I'm concerned because I've lived here since 1965, long

before BFI got here. And I remember when they did start out, they had protections, at that point, without the attention of the community being focused on, that were really not up to par. We can remember the people who lived here back then, waking up in the morning, and having some of the most horrible smells that you can imagine.

Well, most of that's been taken care of since then, but the other thing that can't be taken care of is the fact we are in a wind tunnel. There's a venturi effect, with the wind coming out of the north and coming over those hills and taking with it every contaminant that it picks up from the landfill. And where do you think it's being dumped?

I'm not just talking about in the neighborhood. I'm talking about on the top layer of your water supply, and there's nothing you can do about that.

Just the idea of building a landfill in the position that has been approved in this community seems kind of ridiculous. So, folks, I just had to get that off my -- I wasn't going to speak, until I sat down, and I saw that picture, and I thought that doesn't talk about the problem, and I think you need a broader perspective than what you read off the slides up here

for BFI. I think my three minutes are, probably, gone. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you, Mr. Feldman. Thank you for coming down today.

Mr. Bondall. And after Mr. Bondall, Dr. Aller.

MR. BONDALL: Good evening, everybody.

I'd like to thank the ladies and gentlemen of the Water Quality Control Board for having us here at the public hearing and the community to have their comments heard here. I agree 100 percent with the previous speaker with the same concerns.

The landfill is less than one mile from the San Fernando groundwater basin, and the pollution from the landfill can potentially be carried out the canyon and reach the groundwater basin, and the second thing he mentioned about the water reservoir, also, it's 1.5 miles from the facility, and the pollution that runs from the runoff water to the ground can contaminate the reservoir, and these are the concerns for the water contamination, and I have the other concern regarding --

I learned in the presentation that there are certain ways which can be accepted, but some of them cannot be accepted. Like sewage and sludge cannot

be not accepted at the landfill, but if I cite a California Board of (inaudible), Subchapter 4, Article 1, Section 20690, the landfills can accept 25 percent of their cover, which is covering off the daily cover of the refuse or garbage.

Twenty-five percent of the sludge can be replaced with the dirt or the clean dirt or the clean soil. That will be, ultimately, at the site. That sludge can leach off other contaminants like heavy metals -- (inaudible) can damage the protective cover of the landfills, which can then to go the groundwater and, ultimately, contaminate our water reservoir.

And the third concern I have -- we're going to move off more than five acres of wetlands. At no cost can we replace the wetlands. I think these are all the concerns being a resident of Granada Hills. I think I should have introduced myself (inaudible). These concerns I have with the landfill. So considering these concerns, I strongly oppose the suspension of the expansion of the Sunshine Canyon Landfill. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you, Mr. Bondall. And the next speaker is Dr. Aller.

DR. ALLER: I would like to thank the board for this hearing and the opportunity to address you. I

represent 460 --

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Could you just say your name for the court reporter.

DR. ALLER: Dr. Wayne Aller. I represent the 460 homes in Knollwood. I'm the president of the Knollwood Property Owners' Association.

I have several concerns. The main one, since this is a Water Board hearing and we're not addressing issues of things like airborne contaminants, there have been three studies, one in England, two in Europe, which show people living within five kilometers' radius, roughly, three-mile radius, of an urban landfill have a significantly greater incidence of cancer and giving birth to stillborn children and/or children with major developmental problems, including autism -- very low probability of that occurring by chance, less than .01, if you live within a one-and-a-half kilometers or less than .05, if you live within five kilometers.

Autism in our age has gone from one in 10,000 children 12 years ago to one in 250 children today. We don't know why. I'm a professor of statistics research design in biopsychology at Cal State Northridge and have done a lot of research in this area. No one knows why.

While these epidemiological studies I just mentioned do not address the toxins causing this devastating human suffering, many other studies have shown that leachates from landfills pollute aquifers, and there are innumerable carcinogens -- in fact, I have a report by Ritter. This is the Ontario, Canada, study, 100-and-some pages, several hundred carcinogens and known health hazards (inaudible), including heavy metals, chlorophenol, trihalomethanes, haloacetic acids.

Now, we're told that the leachate removal system will take care of all these things. That's possible. What it won't take care of is a major thrust fault rupturing the lining. If that happens -- and it could well happen -- as you well know, this is a heavy seismic area. My son was on the staff at Cal Tech when the '94 earthquake took place.

His article says that the global positioning satellites indicated that Oat Mountain right above the landfill went up 25 inches, then, came down six and moved north six inches. If that had occurred at a slightly more surface area, there would have been major movement of the earth, and you can't build a liner that will withstand that.

So the leachates are going to spill out,

and the down-gradient, as you well know, the Jensen Water Filtration Plant and the reservoir, is hundreds of feet below and directly down the slope, as you pointed out. The slope is from the northwest to the southeast. That's exactly where those leachates are going to go in the event of a major earthquake.

That is a major concern of mine. The other thing I would point out is that although this is not a hazardous waste site, the estimates are industrywide that about 7 percent of what goes into a nonhazardous Class III waste landfill is, in fact, hazardous.

Friends of mine in the medical community tell me that more and more radioactive stuff gets sent home with patients who, then, put it in their garbage cans, and it ends up in the landfill.

That trend is going to increase. Some of these radioactive materials have half lives of 10 to 40 years. This is going to be an increasing problem, and it's going to affect the leachate, and if there's a major earthquake, the lining is going to rupture, and I'm afraid that 17 million people, which is what I understand that the reservoir serves, at least, all of Los Angeles, and I understand Orange County and lots of other places get their water from there -- is going to be compromised.

I don't think, in this day and age, there's anyplace for urban landfills. There are sites that are 40 miles from the nearest town, and that town has 300 -- I shouldn't say. I don't know how many people Brawley has, and that's once all of our landfills. They'll be able to take it more than 100 years.

In fact, all of Southern California -- they have all the land cover. It's an old gold mine that's huge. It's like 40 times the size of what we're proposing here.

The other thing I might just point out is the Autobahn Society and Sierra Club both oppose the mitigation that's being proposed for the loss of the wetlands. That mitigation is to take place in Chatsworth. They don't want it there. They think it's a terrible idea. So for all those reasons, I would suggest that you, actually, not approve this project. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you.

Mr. Dave Edwards.

MR. EDWARDS: Hi. My name is Dave Edwards. I'm the project director for the Sunshine Canyon project. I'm here simply to answer any questions that the board or board staff may have, along with members of our team. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you, Mr. Edwards.

I have two cards that I've just been handed from Sue Hendricks and from John Hendricks.

Were you here when we gave the oath?

So these will be our final three speakers, and then, there will be some time for Mr. Dickerson to respond to questions.

Ma'am, could you stand as well.

Audience participants of the Los Angeles Water Board Meeting, having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Mr. John Hendricks.

MR. HENDRICKS: Yes. I am John Hendricks. I have something I just want to read. I've lived here in Granada Hills for about eight years. I'm the former president of one of the homeowners' associations around here.

Back in 1999, I went to the city council about every darn week trying to fight this dump, and I solicited and handed out information. I spent hours and hours and hours doing work that our council members should have been doing and didn't, and first of all, there's no need for this dump whatsoever.

In Europe, where land is too precious to be used as an open-pit sewer, they use American technology and American machinery and spend money to American companies to make our garbage, all the stuff that we produce, into environmentally responsible stuff. I mean, like the stuff they build houses out of in building materials.

So just the idea of an open-pit dump is absolutely archaic. It's just shouldn't be entered into the question. Okay. All open-pit landfills leak leachate. I have reports that I'll give you.

There's tons of Web sites providing data, like from the University of Oklahoma and the University of California, California Department of Mines and Geology, stating that all dumps leak leachate. They will eventually leak it.

They won't leak it for 10 or 20 or 30 years, but they will in 40 or 50 or 60, and they do because of the tremendous pressures built up, because of the eons, the decades, of rain that gets in there that mixes this most horrible toxic substance.

I mean, how many countless thousands of tons of baby diapers and pet feces and batteries and pesticides and everything and dormitories and the meat cuttings from grocery markets. Everything you can

think of ends up in that dump, and what happens is that that dump gets filled up with rain, and their vent systems fail, and they work for a few years, but eventually, they get clogged up, and then, the liners begin to rupture, either from lightening strikes or earthquakes or just from the sheer tremendous pressures of millions of cubic yards.

I mean, that dump -- if it's finished, that will be the world's largest open-pit dump right amongst a growing community. You guys have -- this is the last stop. You guys can say no to this. You guys can do what the city council didn't do.

When I was poking around with this, I went down to the City Ethics Commission, and BFI was the second largest contributor to nearly every member on the city council. You guys can come in here and do your job, which is to protect the citizens. Please, do your job and protect the citizens.

I don't think you have the lobbyist attitude that our city council did because they have failed us. Plus the city -- the city is in more than -- absolutely, has agreed to buy Mesquite and Eagle Mountain, which are both gigantic dumps, which BFI wants to thwart because that business won't go to them, and another factor is that BFI has a stated

criminal history of committing felony acts of environmental violations all the time.

I can provide you with everything. I can provide you with all the footnotes. There are Web sites you can go to. The city council has failed us. I shouldn't have had to do all that work. The city council should have been doing all that work.

Please, please, deny this thing. Stretch it out. I'm going to give you a piece of paper with my name and number on it. If you think that anything I've said you need backup on, I will tell you. I'll tell you the Web sites. The California Department of Mines and Geology. I can support every item I've said.

Please, do your job and protect us. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you.

MRS. HENDRICKS: I'm Sue Hendricks. I wasn't originally going to speak, but I'll just add to everything he said and say, of course, you're the water management board, and I'm sure everybody else said this, but we missed that. It's too close to the dump.

You're going to have the air particulates flying down to your open water pits, and all of the liners do eventually leak. Our babies are going to be here in 40 years, 50 years. They are going to be the

ones dealing with this, not BFI, and they'll be dead when this all goes on, but our kids are the legacy that are going to have to deal with this problem and with everything that causes it.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Mrs. Janice Vansteen.

MRS. VANSTEEN: My name is Janice Vansteen. I'm a resident of Granada Hills for the past 30 years.

When I originally moved into Granada Hills in 1973, I thought I was moving to heaven. It is absolutely beautiful here in this community, and it is a shame that the Water Board will not consider this community and not give them a permit. Save the community by not allowing them to have that expansion.

I have on Tennyson Place nine cases of cancer since that dump has been here -- nine cases; some households, two people in a house with cancer; and this has got to stop. The board adopted a health study which needs to look at the number of cases in the 91344 ZIP code to determine the increase of cancer as opposed to other areas without a dump in the area.

It was noted in the news recently that over 700 people per day are coming into Southern California, migrating from other areas to take residence. That means more trash and garbage being collected from the increase.

There's more houses being built in the Palmdale and other areas and in this area here that will increase trash and rubbish. My daughter lives in Washington State, and they don't have a big landfill like this that's going to detrimentally hurt the community.

What they do -- they pay $16 a month for one trash collection can to be picked up, and they dispose of it not in a landfill. They pick up, and they dispose of the recyclable can, and they charge them $25 every three months to pick up the recycled items.

You would be surprised, when you charge people for picking up trash, how they break down the trash and recycle it and disperse it far greater than just throwing a whole carton of junk in the trash. They break it down smaller, and it gets into a different place.

We could have the money to pay to take it out to the desert and dispose of it in the desert somewhere, where you don't have a thriving community of people living there. There's other alternatives to giving them this expansion.

You're going to ruin a beautiful community by allowing this. This is the time for us to speak up.

It's too bad that we haven't had enough people to speak or to say what we really feel. This is a ruination of a lovely community. We all moved here for a better life.

I don't think you were here when we had the earthquake and we saw the smoke coming out of the hills as the ground opened during the earthquake, and it was like smoke signals being sent up by Indians -- how many pollutants and stuff got into the air and into the water.

Even though we boiled our water when we had the earthquake, the sludge was still in the water, and we couldn't drink it. There is a problem, and the problem is there's not enough people on the Water Board or anywhere else caring about the people that live in this community, and I think we need not give them an expansion of anything. Let's try other areas of how we dispose of the trash. Thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you, Mrs. Vansteen. Thank you everybody. Thank you for coming down and taking your time this evening to participate and to give public testimony and to listen to your neighbors and to allow us to listen to you.

That will conclude the public portion. So we're going to go right into having Mr. Dickerson and

staff answer some of the issues or give staff answers to some of the issues that you've raised tonight, and of course, as you know, this is going to come before the full board on July 24th.

Additionally, comments that you may want staff to respond to and that you want the board to consider need to be given to the board, mailed to the board office, before July 8th.

And, Mr. Nelson, if you'll let everybody know who you are, we'll give you an address, if you need one and want to mail comments in or give us references to a report. Anything that you think is important for staff to look at, if you would, please, get it to us, but it needs to come in before July 8th because staff needs to be able to look at it, respond to it, and then, it needs to be able to be distributed to all eight board members in time for us to read it before the meeting.

So we really need you to do that in a timely way in order for us to be able to absorb what it is you have to say, and with that, I'll say thank you, once again, for coming, and I'll turn the mic over to Mr. Dickerson.

MR. DICKERSON: Thank you, again.

Rod, if you could join us up at the podium,

please. I'd like to just, once again, remind everyone that the staff is going to be taking all the questions that we've heard, both today and in written comments that we get before the end of the comment period.

Rod, was that July 8 -- the comment period?

MR. NELSON: July 8. We'd like to receive the comments by July 8.

MR. DICKERSON: So if you have any written comments, they need to come to us by July 8, and staff will then prepare a detailed list of responses to comments, and it's quite possible that, because of the questions you asked, there may be some changes made to the Tentative Draft Permit. If that occurs, there would be some modifications made, and that document will be available before the board meeting.

THE AUDIENCE: Are we going to get any kind of feedback from the board about our comments tonight --

MR. DICKERSON: Yes.

THE AUDIENCE: -- automatically?

MR. DICKERSON: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: That's what he's doing right now.

MR. DICKERSON: So I just want to emphasize that beyond what we're here to talk about tonight, we

really would like to get your thoughts in writing, if at all possible, and there was a sign-up sheet, as you came in this evening, and please, make sure that we have your address because what we'd like to do is send out a response document so that you have in writing what the staff responses are in advance of our meeting. I think that's very important for you to get that, and we'd like to make sure you have that.

THE AUDIENCE: What's the address that we're supposed to send this into?

MR. DICKERSON: We'll make sure you get that. There were some questions posed this evening and, certainly, this afternoon. We're going to respond to some of them right now, and the remainder are going to be addressed in the written document, and we're going to touch on, I think, some of those significant questions that were asked both earlier today and this evening.

So one of the main questions that came up is: What if the experts are wrong? What if we, as Regional Board staff, have made a mistake or we've made an assumption that's incorrect?

What I want to indicate there is that, certainly, experts can be wrong. It happens, and we're, certainly, not free of fault, and any permit,

any environmental activity, has to have redundancy. It has to have the ability to make corrections, the ability to correct errors.

And in my presentation, I talked about corrective action. So any permit will have provisions that apply to what goes wrong. What needs to be done to deal with that? And the Regional Board itself has the ability to issue directives, has the opportunity to do enforcement, whatever is appropriate, whatever is needed, to correct some sort of problem. It's just part of the framework within which these permits are developed.

Another question had to do with enforcement. We didn't talk about that this evening, but someone mentioned that there were something like 91 violations associated with the Sunshine Canyon Landfill, and a number of those have nothing to do with water quality, and what I'd like to do is -- Rod, if we could just briefly outline for the audience here what the specific water quality problems were.

MR. NELSON: I'm Rod Nelson. I'm with the Landfill Regional Board here in Los Angeles. I'm head of the landfill unit at the Regional Board. So that's one of the many units that we have.

THE AUDIENCE: You work for BFI; yeah?

MR. DICKERSON: We're not going to engage in a sort of back and forth --

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Go ahead, Mr. Nelson.

MR. NELSON: Anyway, we went through our records as far back as the early '80s to see what violations had occurred with regard to water quality in our direct areas of concern, and for the City Side portion of the landfill, which operated from about 1959 until 1991, we came up with five violations over a -- actually, '59 to '91. That's 32 years, I guess. Yeah.

Actually, our agency did not issue a permit to Sunshine Canyon Landfill until 1987, but we first noted a violation in 1982. We did, apparently, have some oversight of the operations there, and they were cited for accepting 20 gallons of chemical and petroleum waste.

Most likely, those were liquids wastes, and none of these Class III landfills that we've been talking about tonight, including Sunshine Canyon, are allowed to take in liquid waste. There was failure to submit the monitoring report. Once we did get a permit on them, we cited them for erosion on the cover material during rainy periods when the dirt that they placed top of the waste had eroded too much and had exposed some waste or created runoff. We cited them

for that.

And, then, we also noticed some ponding on top of the landfill a couple of years after it closed. Waste settles over the years, and it sits there, and nothing settles evenly. So you get low spots occurring, and those can create a spot for water to collect, and we don't allow that.

You're supposed to maintain a slope on these landfills so that the water will run off and not congregate in one spot. So that was the sort of violation we had for the City Side.

The County Side, we noted three violations, one in 1996 and two in 2001. The one in 1996 was one I, actually, reported. I happened to be out there, and it had to do with the slope of the land that was such that any rainfall would collect against the waste, and they, then, regraded the area.

Again, there was a ponding issue, a low spot on top of the landfill, where water is collected, and they had to correct that, and then, the most important one here is May of 2001 when volatile organic compounds, which Mr. Dickerson has been speaking about tonight, were detected beneath the liner system in the County Extension Landfill, the one that's currently open, and we directed BFI to submit a plan of how they

were going to remedy this situation because we're not supposed to get detections of landfill constituents underneath the landfill, in particular. They submitted a plan to us, and we concur with what they're doing, and they have been reducing the concentrations of landfill contaminations beneath the landfill.

MR. DICKERSON: So, in summary, whenever there's a violation, we follow up and take appropriate action. I would like to just mention, as a side note, that you may have seen an article recently in the paper about enforcement being taken at the Bradley Landfill, and Mr. Nelson was one of our staff who was there, cooperating with the city attorney's office in a comprehensive multi-agency inspection, and this is the kind of thing that we engage in to ensure that we have adequate oversight of these facilities that are permanent.

There was a question raised about, when permits conflict, one may be more stringent than another, which one might prevail, and who would enforce, and I think I can safely say that the Regional Board has a very high commitment toward enforcement.

We have one of the strongest enforcement records, among the regional boards in the state. We have staff who are very well trained to conduct a

course of inspections, and the agency that would have the most stringent permit requirements, generally, would be the one that is in force.

We do have a close relationship with the attorney general's office and, also, the city attorney, should that be necessarily pursued in enforcement action.

There was a question raised about self-monitoring, and I just wanted to talk a little bit about that. The question had to do with the integrity of the system that the regional boards have for addressing the kind of sampling that's done.

We have many hundreds of permittees of various kinds, not just -- there's a handful of these landfills, but there's also many sewage treatment plants and other kinds of industrial dischargers into surface waters, and we require monitoring to occur of those -- to take samples, send them to a certified laboratory, and then, to report the results of that information to us.

That information is done under penalty of perjury, and there's enforcements that can be taken for falsifying that data. So the question had to do with, well, can we be confident that the data that we're getting from that program is accurate.

In addition to that, we have our own sampling that occurs. It's not as extensive. It's more of a spot check, but it's intended to show that the data that is being collected does have integrity, and as I noted, there were very significant criminal penalties for violations of that laboratory analysis.

One real theme of questions that come through this afternoon and this evening has to do with earthquakes and the safety of the landfill, given the fact there may be various different kinds of faults and how would an earthquake affect the integrity of the liner system, and there is an analysis that has to be done by the State of California Department of Water Resources, and Rod, if I could ask you to address that a little bit, please.

MR. NELSON: One the requirements of our permits is that the discharge of the operator prevent technical design plans of how they're going to build the place, and one of those plans has to do with the construction of the containment of the liner system, and we have very comprehensive State and Federal Regulations. It's a very large cook book. It's a "how to" book to build a landfill of this sort.

One of those requirements is that any containment feature you have -- and this is

specifically California -- must withstand the biggest earthquake that is likely to occur within a hundred-year period that could impact the landfill or whatever operations -- that have similar requirements, but in the case of our California regulations, there is a specific requirement within the design standards of how severe an earthquake the landfill must be able to withstand without having any adverse impacts in the containment system. That is a very complicated, sophisticated issue.

Regional Board staff does not have all the technical knowledge and experience to thoroughly evaluate some of these designs. So we have contracted, via the State Water Resources Control Board, an independent third party. In this case, it's been for the last four or five years. The State Department of Water Resources, a Division of Dam Safety -- we have a good working relationship with them. They are well-known throughout the industry as an unbiased third party. They give very thorough reviews, and once their review has been completed, all parties accept their conclusions.

So we are sensitive to and very aware of concerns about earthquakes in this area, and I think we do a good job of addressing those issues.

MR. DICKERSON: It's my understanding that, given the concern that we do have about earthquake seismic activity in the area, our Regional Board, as compared to other regional boards, impose more stringent requirements. Isn't that true?

MR. NELSON: Yes. As a matter of fact, I forgot to mention that. As I said, the standards here for California are for the largest earthquake that could impact an operation that's likely to occur within a hundred-year period.

We have required Sunshine Canyon, in all our active Class III municipal solid waste landfills, to design or contain the systems to withstand the largest earthquake that could conceivably occur and impact that area without regard to the time period.

So I believe we're about the only Regional Board that requires that for all of our sites.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay. Thank you.

One last question, and that had to do with: How can we assure people about what's going to happen in 30 or 40 years from now, that concern being that there may be age to the liner compaction? Any number of different factors could play into having a leak in the system. What are the protective measures in place? What can people expect down the road?

MR. NELSON: Well, as time goes by and the waste deteriorates, it becomes less of a threat. The length of time before that threat is realistically removed can be a very long time. However, our regulations require that once one of these landfills has closed, they have to continue to maintain and monitor that landfill for a minimum of 30 years, at which time Regional Board would look to see, based on the monitoring that was done in the 30-year period following the closure of the landfill -- was giving any indication that there were problems.

If there were, the problems would have to be addressed, and again, a 30-year period would resume from zero -- the Regional Board retains authority in the event there's some sort of a release and it requires action to be taken to stop that.

Certainly, 30 years is a minimum period of time, and the operator of the landfill, before they close, before they stop making money, has to put aside a set amount that is approved by the State Board that will allow them to continue to maintain the effectiveness of any environmental controls of the landfill and maintain its cover and integrity for a period of 30 years.

They have that money in the bank that would

allow them to do that without having to get into any other source of income. They are, also, required, in addition, to have a separate fund set aside -- and the fund I just spoke of is just for normal day-to-day maintenance operations. Nothing out of the ordinary. Just what would be required to maintain the environmental controls and make sure that the cover is maintained in that for a period of 30 years.

The other fund that is distinct and separate from this is -- have enough money set aside to repair the environmental impact of any -- and this is kind of a jargon here, but it's called, "Any reasonably foreseeable release."

So irrespective of the economic liability of the operator, there's these two funds that are separate and set aside and cannot be used for anything other than those two.

MR. DICKERSON: Okay. Thank you very much.

All the other questions that have been raised, we're going to make sure they get responded to in writing, and as I said earlier, please, make sure we have your address, and we can send that to you. We want to make sure you get that.

With that, I'll turn the microphone back over to our chairwoman, Susan Cloke.

CHAIRWOMAN CLOKE: Thank you, Mr. Dickerson, and thank you to our staff for all the work that they did in preparing for this public community meeting and hearing on the proposal. Thank you all for being here tonight, and with that, this public hearing is closed.

(Proceedings adjourned at 7:44 P.M.)

* * *

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

I, Catherine Scott, Certified Shorthand Reporter, in and for the County of Los Angeles, State of California, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were reported by me stenographically and later transcribed into typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings taken at the time and place indicated herein.

In witness whereof, I have subscribed my name this _____ day of _____, 2003, at Los Angeles, California.

_____
Catherine Scott, CSR No. 3375